I. YURKOVETS

# The Philosophy of Dialectical Materialism

PROGRESS
Guides to the Social Sciences

I. YURKOVETS

# The Philosophy of Dialectical Materialism

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
MOSCOW

Translated from the Russian by *Ludmila Lezhneva* and *Andrei Zur*

И. Юрковец

ДИАЛЕКТИКО-МАТЕРИАЛИСТИЧЕСКАЯ ФИЛОСОФИЯ

*На английском языке*

© Издательство "Прогресс", 1984
English translation © Progress Publishers 1984
*Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*

$Ю\ \frac{0302020000-214}{014\,(01)-84}\ 10-84$

# Contents

**Foreword** . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 7

*CHAPTER I* **PHILOSOPHY AND ITS ROLE IN THE LIFE OF SOCIETY** . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 8

1. What is Philosophy? . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 8
2. Materialism and Idealism: The Foundations of the Two Ideologies of the Opposing Classes . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 11

*CHAPTER II* **DEVELOPMENT OF MATERIALISM: BASIC STAGES AND PREREQUISITES FOR ITS TRANSFORMATION INTO A SCIENTIFIC PHILOSOPHY** . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 18

1. The Origins of Materialism and Its Proponents . . . . . . . . . . . 18
2. Conditions of and Prerequisites for Materialism Turning into a Science . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 22
3. The Emergence of a Dialectical Materialist Philosophy and Its Radical Distinction from Preceding Philosophy . . . . . . . . . . . 26
4. Dialectical Materialist Philosophy: Its Subject Matter, Purpose and Role . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 33

*CHAPTER III* **DIALECTICAL MATERIALIST PHILOSOPHY ON THE ESSENCE OF THE WORLD AND THE FORMS OF ITS EXISTENCE** . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 37

1. What Does the World Represent? What Is Matter? . . . . . . . . . 37
2. Movement as a Mode of Existence of Matter . . . . . . . . . . . . 45
3. Space and Time: Universal Forms of Existence of Matter . . . . . 49
4. Material Unity and Diversity of the World . . . . . . . . . . . . . 50

*CHAPTER IV* **DIALECTICAL MATERIALIST PHILOSOPHY ON THE ORIGINS OF LIFE, MAN AND CONSCIOUSNESS** . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 53

1. The Origins of Life on Earth and Its Development . . . . . . . . . 55
2. The Origin of Man and Human Consciousness . . . . . . . . . . . . 73
3. Consciousness and the Brain. Consciousness vs. the Soul . . . . . . 79

*CHAPTER V* **DEVELOPMENT OF THE WORLD AND ITS LAWS** . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 90

1. Development as a Dialectical Process . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 91
2. Basic Laws of the Development of the World . . . . . . . . . . . . 95
3. Universal Relationships in the Objective World. Non-Basic Laws of Dialectics . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 109

*CHAPTER VI* **IS THE WORLD AROUND US COGNIZABLE AND HOW DOES MAN COGNIZE IT?** . . . . . . . . 125

1. The Sensual and Logical Stages of Cognition . . . . . . . . . . . . 126
2. Methods and Forms of Scientific Cognition . . . . . . . . . . . . . 130
3. What Is Truth? . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 137

*CHAPTER VII* **HUMAN SOCIETY AND ITS DEVELOPMENT** 142
1. The Origin of Society. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 143
2. Does Society Develop and What Underlies Its Development? . . . 147
3. The Natural Environment and the Demographic Factor as Constant and necessary Conditions of social Development . . . . 153

*CHAPTER VIII* **TYPES OF SOCIETY AND THE LAWS OF THEIR SUCCESSION** . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 157
1. Types of Society, the Nature and Rates of Their Development . . 158
2. Social Development as a Natural Historical Process. . . . . . . . . 165

*CHAPTER IX* **CLASSES AND CLASS RELATIONS** . . . . . . 170
1. What Are Classes and How Were They Formed? . . . . . . . . . . 171
2. Class Relations Under Feudalism and Capitalism . . . . . . . . . . 174
3. Class Struggle as a Consequence of the Operation of Exploiter Societies. Ways of Eliminating Class Distinctions and Classes . . . 180

*CHAPTER X* **POLITICAL ORGANIZATION OF SOCIETY** . 186
1. What Is the State? Historical Types of the State . . . . . . . . . . 187
2. The State After the Overthrow of the Exploiters' Rule . . . . . . 192

*CHAPTER XI* **SOCIAL REVOLUTIONS**. . . . . . . . . . . . 202
1. The Revolution: Its Motive Forces and Conditions for Carrying It Out. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 202
2. Historical Types of Social Revolution . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 207

*CHAPTER XII* **HISTORICAL FORMS OF SOCIAL COMMUNITY** . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 213
1. What Are a Clan, Tribe, Nationality and Nation? How Did They Come into Being? . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 213
2. National Relations Under Capitalism and Socialism. The Future of Nations . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 221

*CHAPTER XIII* **SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS: ITS STRUCTURE AND FORMS** . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 229
1. Social Ideology and Social Psychology and Their Class Essence . 229
2. Religious Cosciousness and Religious Attitudes . . . . . . . . . . 236

*CHAPTER XIV* **THE REACTIONARY NATURE OF MODERN BOURGEOIS PHILOSOPHY**. . . . . . . . . . . . . 245
1. Modern Bourgeois Philosophy: The Main Trends and Their Untenability . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 246
2. Bourgeois Philosophy and the Ideological Struggle Over the Social and Cultural Heritage of the Newly-Free Countries . . . . . 252

**Conclusion**. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 258
**Glossary of Philosophical Terms**. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 260

# FOREWORD

Man constantly has to solve one problem or another and to decide how to act. Whether has decisions, actions and so on are correct or not largely depends on his general ideas about the surrounding world, his world outlook or philosophical position.

For this reason problems pertaining to philosophy and philosophical education come to the fore in practically all fields. They acquire special importance during a revolutionary transformation when it is very difficult to make the necessary choice and to determine one's class and political position. To avoid mistakes, man has to have some training in philosophy.

The present textbook deals with the basic tenets of scientific dialectical materialism and analyzes, among other things, the role philosophy plays in the life of man and society, what kind of philosophy is useful to people and what is, on the contrary, harmful, what philosophy should be studied and what opposed.

The book gives answers to the most burning questions of world outlook as, for example, what is the Universe? How did man with his ability to think come into being? How did human society emerge and why do people often struggle against each other? What awaits mankind in the future?

This publication is intended for those who take up philosophy for the first time; it can also be used by educational establishments as a textbook.

*Chapter I*

# PHILOSOPHY AND ITS ROLE IN THE LIFE OF SOCIETY

In the newly-free countries children of the working people and the progressive intelligentsia first had the chance to study philosophy thanks to the victory of the liberation revolutions. Previously it was the privilege of the select. And yet this branch of knowledge is the treasury of human thought accumulated in the course of the centuries–old history of the development of human knowledge, and therefore includes the efforts made by thinkers from the newly free countries.

## 1. What Is Philosophy?

Philosophy is a system of ideas, views and concepts of the surrounding world, people, human society and the meaning of man's life. It is an important component of social sciences as a whole and its conclusions underlie the natural and social sciences. In one way or another they effect socio-historical practice. What good is philosophy to ordinary people? After all, their ancestors knew nothing of it and were none the worse for it.

It is true that they were unaware of it, just like blind people are unaware of many things. However, hardly anybody would voluntarily agree to become blind. As a matter of fact, to live completely ignorant of what is going on around and what are the reasons behind these goings-on is like living with impaired eyesight.

This was the situation most of our ancestors found themselves in and the same holds true of many millions of people on Earth who know nothing of philosophy today.

Thus, it is only natural that thousands of years ago the wisest men of different countries and nations and different generations sought to make people "see the light". Today, too, men seek to achieve the same by using knowledge amassed by the sciences, particularly philosophy. Studying it, people learn to orientate themselves correctly in the surrounding world. Philosophy helps them to find answers to such questions as: what is the world around us like? How did man with his ability to think come into being? Why some people are rich and others poor? What should be done to make all people on Earth, irrespective of their social origin, nationality, faith and so on, equal and happy? It is impossible to understand the international and domestic problems of any country, the complicated questions of modern science and the development of all fields of social life without a knowledge of philosophy.

Apart from being important to the development of world outlook, the study of philosophy is also an important factor in achieving liberation from social and intellectual slavery.

Not all philosophies can prove helpful, however. There have always been a multitude of philosophical schools in the world, and far from every philosophy offers correct answers to problems people face. It is therefore always necessary to know what philosophy should be studied and what opposed.

With this aim in view it is worth considering in detail the essence of philosophical knowledge and the history of its development.

## Two Trends in Philosophy

Philosophy appeared more than 2,500 years ago as a result of the people's desire to get at the heart of Nature, to master it and to make man's life better and more interesting. Initially it incorporated all kinds of knowledge people had at the time, and philosophers were then called the all-knowing wise men. Hence the name "philosophy" (from Greek), that is, love *(philo)* of knowledge and wisdom *(sophos).* But it is not at all easy to comprehend Nature, which is a complex and multiform reality. Many of its mysteries remain hidden today, and it is therefore small wonder that not all the philosophers were equally successful in unravelling the mysteries of the Universe or in pinpointing its essence.

On the one hand, people marvelled to see the surrounding world so "rational": in autumn trees shed their leaves and then again grow them in spring, ants and bees exemplify rational organization and so on.

All this created the impression that the world was organized in a rational way, which could not have happened of its own accord. Consequently, someone must have organized it this way. Some philosophers therefore believed that the world was created by a "supreme mind", a "world spirit" or an "absolute idea". According to these philosophers, "ideas" form the basis of the material world, precede it and even generate it. As these philosophers considered ideas to be primary, they began to be called *idealists.*

On the other hand, the more perspicacious philosophers observed that all the processes taking place in the world have a *natural* character. For example, the eclipse of the Sun or the Moon has to do with objective, that is, not depending on man's consciousness, laws of the motion of planets of the solar system. That is why scientists can predict these phenomena many hundreds years ahead. The rise and fall of the tide in seas and oceans are connected with the Moon's rotation round the Earth, and so on. All this led to the conclusion that the world existed on its own as eternal reality, as matter that had been created by nobody and was constantly changing. Matter exists objectively and is therefore *primary*, while consciousness, thought and ideas, that is, the reflection by man's mind of the material world surrounding him, are *secondary*. Philosophers who recognized matter as primary and consciousness as secondary came to be called *materialists*.

In this way philosophers of all times and of all nations are divided into two large groups, *materialists* and *idealists*. They offer the world two kinds of philosophy, *materialist* and *idealist*. Thus philosophical knowledge has had two trends – the *materialist* and the *idealist*.

## The Fundamental Question of Philosophy and Its Two Aspects

Philosophers are divided in their views on the relationship between consciousness and matter. Which of these two is primary and which is secondary? – this is known as the *fundamental question of philosophy*.

Philosophers also disagreed on another related problem, namely, whether the world was cognizable or not?

The idealists for the most part refused to recognize the world as knowable and continue to do so. According to them, the "supreme reason" and the "world idea" could only be cognized by these supernatural powers themselves. This knowledge was beyond man's reach. Hence the conclusion that the world was unknowable. Philosophers who maintained that it was impossible to cognize the world came to be called *agnostics* (from the Greek *"a"*–not, and *"gnosis"*–knowledge). The materialists, on the contrary, for the most part held that if the world exists objectively it is possible to cognize it, and this has been exemplified extensively by practice.

In short, philosophers' answer to this question so closely depended on their answer to the question of the relationship between matter and consciousness that they came to be viewed as the two aspects of one and the same question, the fundamental question of philosophy.

Now that the reader sees the essence of philosophy and its fundamental question, he may wonder whether this disagreement between philosophers is all that important for man (or even for theory and practice). Couldn't they be just wasting their time by posing one and the same problem for more than two and a half millennia and never reaching an unambiguous conclusion?

It is utterly erroneous to doubt the importance of the fundamental question of philosophy and the need for an exact answer to it. This seemingly abstract quesion reflects the fundamentally different interests of the opposing classes, the interests of every human being.

Let us view in detail the essence of differences between these two trends.

## 2. Materialism and Idealism: The Foundations of the Two Ideologies of the Opposing Classes

### Epistemological Roots of Idealism

It has been shown above that materialism and idealism resulted from different approaches to explaining the world around us, the former from authentic and the latter from false knowledge.

The early idealists were indeed mistaken. After all idealism is a one-sided exaggeration or overestimation of one element of cognition or another and a distorted picture of nature, thinking and social life. That is why the existence of idealism is sometimes explained in terms of the theory of cognition, that is, by its epistemological causes (roots). There are some idealists today who err, unable to unravel some mysteries of nature or to explain them, and who sincerely believe their misconception to be truth.

But idealism has existed not merely because some people erred and still err when trying to grasp the essence of the surrounding world. Had it been the only reason, the modern level of the development of knowledge would have left no room for idealism in man's mind.

Materialists have long been treating the fundamental question of philosophy as the fundamental law of materialism rather than as a question. It will always be fundamental as long as idealism exists and has to be disputed as far as the nature of the world is concerned. There is also the problem of the relationship between the material and the ideal, of the phenomena pertaining either to the world of objects or to the mind. This is, however, a different problem.

If it had only been for epistemological reasons, idealism would hardly have had any advocates left: people would perhaps have forgotten all about it. Then what accounts for its existence?

## Class Roots of Idealism

It turns out that the existence of idealism has to do with some social conditions, or class causes (or roots).

The earliest class society had two leading classes, the slaves and the slave-owners. The latter mercilessly exploited the former, selling and killing them, treating them as subhumans and using them as "speaking tools". The unbearable conditions of life made slaves fight for their emancipation but they were ruthlessly dealt with. The exploiters felt the need to theoretically justify their right to privileges. Engaged entirely in intellectual activities, they sought to show that the intellectual field was the most important aspect of human life. Conversely, material production which involved the working classes was something base and of secondary importance. It was dependent on the intellectual activities of the ruling classes, hence consciousness and the mind were primary and matter secondary. As people strove to discover the reasons for their plight, it was necessary to prove that that was something beyond man's reach, for the world was unknowable.

With its interpretation of the role of classes in the life of society and its assertions that the spiritual antecedes the material and that the world is unknowable, idealism well serves the exploiter classes today, just as it did before. For this reason the exploiters have been doing everything possible to strengthen the positions of idealism. On the one hand, they encourage in every way the exponents of idealism and produce a system of the ideological indoctrination of the young in the spirit of idealism and so on. For example, the Vatican alone subsidizes about 500 universities and other educational centres in the world so that idealist philosophy is taught there.

On the other hand, idealist philosophers in expressing the interests of the exploiters bend over backwards to supply ever new "arguments" in defence of exploitation. They pretend to be still looking for truth when debating whether the world is material or ideal. In fact, far from striving to clarify the matter, they do their utmost to distort it. All means are brought into play to convince the people that they cannot find the causes of their destitution because the existing order was allegedly created not by the people but by the supreme reason, the world idea. It is stressed in every way that this order was created in its final form and cannot be changed.

That is why idealist philosophers especially nowadays vigorously propagandize and use in practice *metaphysics,* which is the doctrine of a method, through which they try to disprove the idea of social development. They resort to it to perpetuate the existence of any exploiter society which justifies private property and hence exploitation and enslavement. Small wonder therefore that idealism is still present in human knowledge and that, owing to forced dissemination and deceit, it dominates the minds of some people even today. Idealism underlies the ideology of the exploiter classes, which consciously use it to subordinate the working classes.

## Class Roots of Materialism

Materialist philosophers, on the contrary, argued that human activity and social life rest above all on material production. People can engage in spiritual activity only provided they have food, dwelling and clothes which are the result of material production. Social material production and, consequently, matter in general are primary, and social consciousness and the intellect secondary. Though the early materialists were still unable to define the role of material production in social life in such a clear-cut way, their materialist stand was largely connected with the need to defend the interests of the working people and all the progressive classes.

For this reason materialism, too, has a class nature. As distinct from the idealists, the materialists are not impeded by this fact in their quest for truth. All their reasoning and conclusions are in strict agreement with real facts and meet the requirements of science. Using the irrefutable argument that material production determines all other types of activity and is itself determined by certain, particularly economic, laws, the materialists believe that by analyzing these laws one can study the laws of social development as a whole and build society on a scientific basis.

Society can develop successfull only provided it is built on the principles of equality and justice, which enable all members of that society to develop and perfect their professional skills and other abilities and, consequently, to augment public wealth. This is to say that society should not have its working classes dispossessed, while the exploiters are virtually wallowing in riches. That is why the materialists appeal to reason and urge that the world should be cognized. They are guided by *dialectics,* the study of the more general laws of the development and cognition of the world, and invite others to do the same. Science has accumulated enough facts proving the veracity of the main materialist ideas about the development of the world, the possibility for cognizing it and so on. Like the world itself, the laws of its development are knowable, including the laws of social development. People can and should be able to build a happy life for themselves, and anyone who comes to realize this indisputable idea espouses materialism. It is only natural that materialism is advocated above all by the working classes and also honest and far-sighted representatives of other social strata. That is why materialism and other social sciences based on its principles are called the *ideology of the working class and all the progressive classes.*

Materialism is opposed by the exploiters because it exposes their unseemly role in society.

The idealists slander their adversaries and do everything they can to discredit materialism. Where their slander meets with no support, they prefer to ignore materialism and to prevent people from learning about it. Nevertheless materialism is influential in an ever growing number of countries and is winning over more and more supporters daily. Materialist ideology is dominant not only in the socialist countries but also in some developing countries, for instance, in the People´s Democratic Republic of Yemen, Ethiopia and others. An Oriental adage has it that even a blind man can see a sun ray. Similarly the truth of materialism will sooner or later reach everyone. Just as it is impossible to blame the Sun for giving out heat, materialism cannot be blamed for bringing truth to the people and calling them to institute justice in society.

As can be seen we have to do not merely with two trends in philosophy or two opposite philosophical systems differing in their answer to the fundamental question of philosophy.

On the one hand, we have to do with a system of reactionary views that is against man, against the correct reflection of being and a radical restructuring the social relations. This is the philosophy of idealism, which reflects the interests of the exploiters and is used to justify most atrocious crimes and the craziest of ideas and theories leading human thought away from the highroad of mankind's advance. Its proponents stand in the way of those who want to build a new life.

Idealist "theories" are not merely conceptions produced by individuals: they have a bearing upon millions of people. This is especially manifest in the struggle waged by the imperialists against the peoples who do not want to build their life on the principles of exploitation and injustice and also in the way the problem of war and peace is solved. The imperialists unleash wars, while the idealists seek to justify them so as to conceal the true reasons behind wars and their instigators, to convince mankind of the inevitability of wars and so on.

On the other hand, we have to do with a philosophy that has realized a good deal and is out to get at the truth of man's being and to help people find a road towards better forms of social organization. The states that are guided by materialist philosophy in their practical activities, as exemplified by the socialist countries, have helped their nations to get rid of exploitation and enslavement and have given them the necessary living standards worthy of man. In other words, this philosophy has become a source of all the revolutionary transformations in society and the methodological basis for the development of entire human knowledge.

Thus the fundamental question of philosophy is extremely important for the two philosophic trends arising from it have in fact a bearing on the destiny of every human being who has to determine his or her attitude to these trends and to decide which side he or she is on.

No honest person can oppose progress, justice and kindness; therefore he cannot but side with materialism. Furthermore, no man of principle can put up with deceit and injustice, or approve of the reactionaries and their crimes against mankind; consequently, he cannot but oppose idealism.

Reality shows that more and more people are daily opting for materialism and are being guided by it in their daily life. They combat idealism and those it urges to defy mankind. Representatives of the working class and the intelligentsia advocating the building of a society without exploitation are among such people in the newly-free countries. All the people in these countries face the need to make a similar choice. Many governments in the emergent states have set themselves the tasks of developing and transforming their social relations, pointing to the need for all the citizens to actively participate in social affairs and to be politically mature. It is impossible to live within a society and to stand aloof from the innermost social problems. In order to make a correct choice of one's stand in life, it is above all important to make a correct choice of one's philosophic stand.

True, there are some people who believe that they have nothing to do with the attitudes adopted by materialists and idealists and their disputes. In their opinion, these contradictions concern only the capitalist and socialist countries, while the developing countries allegedly have a special ideology of their own.

I hope there is no need to prove that these people are mistaken. There have been quite a few examples to the effect in the history of philosophical thought. For instance, philosophers know only too well the sorry record of the *dualists,* the *Machists* and advocates of other similar trends.

The dualists sought to share the attitudes of both the materialists and the idealists, and to work out a "third" trend or a "third" line in philosophy on this basis. They maintained that the world consists of two (*duo* in Latin) entities, matter and mind.

The Machists, who got their name after the Austrian physicist and philosopher, Ernst Mach, considered that the world was made of special "elements of the world" rather than of matter or by consciousness. Both the former and the latter believed that they had overcome the extremes of materialism and idealism in their philosophy, which was superior to these two trends. History showed, however, that both were deeply mistaken. By leading human thought away from truly scientific knowledge—materialism, both the dualists and the Machists served the cause of idealism and the cause of reaction.

The ideologists, who try today to work out a so-called "third" ideology for the Third World, do not serve the cause of progress either. There is no "Third World", just as there is no "first" nor "second" world. There is but one world that is split into two groups of classes, the exploiters and the exploited. That is why, no matter what part of the world one country or another is situated in, what nation or race inhabits it or what its development level is, that, if based on private property, is always an arena for only two ideologies—idealism and materialism. The ideological struggle between the world of capitalism and that of socialism is the struggle between the ideology of the exploiters and that of the working and progressive classes, because the socialist countries express the interests of the working people throughout the world. Therefore there is no, nor can there ever be, any third ideology.

The enemies of materialism attempt, however, to convince people of little experience in philosophy that the materialists' insistence on the unambiguous affiliation with one philosophical trend or another leaves no room for "personal conscience", "free spirit" and religious feelings. This is sheer nonsense. The materialists, far from encroaching upon freedom of conscience, the right to profess any religion and so on, on the contrary, advocate such social transformations that would create real possibilities for guaranteeing genuine personal freedoms, including freedom of conscience, that is, the right to profess any religion.

To choose correctly one's stance in life, one should not merely choose a philosophical position, but adopt precisely a materialist philosophy. It is a matter of honour for every thinking person to study this philosophy deeply and systematically.

To sum up, philosophy has a great role to play in the life of society: it enables people to work out a scientific system of views of the surrounding world and fosters in them a mature *world outlook.* Guided by philosophical principles, people master certain *methods* of solving daily problems. Hence philosophy has the function of a *world outlook* and a *methodology.*

What should be kept in mind is that not any type of philosophy benefits people or helps them in choosing their road in life. For example, idealism does harm to the people because it misleads them. Materialism alone is of benefit to the people, as it helps them to understand life.

In conclusion we shall name some of the materialists, idealists and "dualists", who most contributed to philosophy.

*Materialists*—Thales, Anaximenes, Anaximander, Anaxagoras, Democritus, Heraclitus, Epicurus, Titus Lucretius Carus, Al-Farabi, Al-Biruni, ibn-Roshd, ibn-Sina, Locke, Diderot, Holbach, Spinoza, Feuerbach, Herzen, Chernyshevsky, Marx, Engels, Lenin and modern materialists, the ideologists of scientific socialism.

*Idealists*–Plato, Thomas Aquinas, Al-Ghazali, Berkeley, Hume, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Mach, Avenarius and other modern bourgeois philosophers.

*Dualists*–Descartes and the proponents of the so-called "third ideology" who express the interests of the reactionary classes, including those in the developing countries.

## *Test Questions*

1. What is philosophy? What do people need it for?
2. What is the essence of the fundamental question of philosophy and its two aspects?
3. What philosophical trends do you know?
4. What is the class essence of materialism and idealism manifest in?
5. What is dialectics and what is metaphysics?
6. What role does materialist philosophy play in the life of society?

*Chapter II*

# DEVELOPMENT OF MATERIALISM: BASIC STAGES AND PREREQUISITES FOR ITS TRANSFORMATION INTO A SCIENTIFIC PHILOSOPHY

A recognition of the incontestable fact that it is only a materialist philosophy that plays a positive role in the life of society is a necessary, even if insufficient, condition of substantiating its superiority over the philosophy of idealism. Materialists have been winning an increasing number of supporters, not by asking them to take their word for granted or by resorting to propagandistic devices and deception the way idealists have been doing it, but by profoundly and scientifically substantiating their basic positions. They invite their friends and opponents alike to take their time to analyze historical facts, to compare and oppose points of view and scientific conclusions underlying their propositions.

Why not accept the invitation?

## 1. The Origins of Materialism and Its Proponents

### Sources of Materialism. Spontaneous Materialism

As noted above, materialist philosophy emerged in early antiquity and grew out of practical requirements and out of the need for replacing the speculation and guesswork current at the time by real knowledge.

This required primarily an analysis of natural phenomena and of social life, as well as a study of cognition problems. Philosophers who pursued this goal began with studying the world around them and looking for the essence of all being. It is on the basis of the analysis of the objective world that data was acquired which convincingly demonstrated that it was material. Among the first researchers to arrive at the idea that the world was material were ancient Greek philosophers Thales (624-547 B.C.), Anaximander (610-546 B.C.) and

Anaximenes (588-525 B.C.).

In search of an answer to the question of the origin of things they came to the conclusion that all being originated in *primary matter* which had not been created by anyone, was eternal and unlimited.

Heraclitus (544-483 B.C.), another ancient Greek philosopher, while accepting the material origin of the universe, held that matter not only exists but constantly changes and develops. Nothing is static, everything is in the state of flux, everything changes. The changes are caused by the struggle of opposites.

The development of a materialist outlook was substantially contributed to by the ancient Greek philosophers Leucippus (500-440 B.C.), and by Lucretius Carus (99-55 B.C.), the philosopher of Ancient Rome. In a justification of a materialist world outlook they held that all objects are composed of infinitesimal, indivisible, absolutely dense and impenetrable particles they called atoms. As they interact with the human senses, the atoms enable man to see the environment, to hear and smell.

The materialist outlook was widespread in Ancient China and Ancient India. Ancient Chinese philosopher Lao Tse (6th-5th centuries B.C.) concluded that human life and nature were governed by a natural law, "the way of things" (tao), rather than by supernatural forces; the material world was in incessant movement and change, with all things becoming their opposites.

In Ancient India, the most consistent philosophical systems were those of *Lokayata* (Charvaka), *Nyaya* and *Vaisesika,* in all of which materialist tendencies were prominent.

The most significant contribution to the development of the philosophy of antiquity was made by Aristotle (384-322 B.C.). A student of Plato (427-347 B.C.), the most outstanding idealist philosopher of Ancient Greece, Aristotle was not fully able to overcome his teacher's idealism, yet never doubted the eternal existence of the material world. He held that the Universe had not been created by any outside force and was indestructible. The world is in perpetual movement and change. Although Aristotle was unable to discover the source, or the cause, of the movement and change, his philosophy was nevertheless conducive to the emergence of an authentic view of the Universe.

The importance of the materialists of Antiquity in the development of philosophical knowledge is enormous.

And still, the *materialism of the ancient philosophers was a naive and spontaneous materialism.* They were not sufficiently consistent in substantiating the material nature of the Universe as a whole and only dealt with its individual elements. They failed to explain the role of production in social life and consequently were unable to suggest the ways of improving social relations. Although it is true that some of them did accord great attention to the problems of improving social relations, the measures they proposed were based on subjective wishes.

The philosophers are not, however, to blame for the underdevelopment and primitivism of the materialism of antiquity. The deficiencies in their studies were primarily due to the underdevelopment of production and insufficiently developed science, as well as to the fact that masses of the working people were unable to produce ideologists of their own who would have expressed the needs of their class to a fuller extent. Thus, the deficiencies of their theories were largely caused by objective reasons.

## Philosophy in Stagnation

The first two centuries A.D. saw no major contribution to the philosophical thought of the Greco-Roman world. In the 3rd century A.D. the slave-owning Roman Empire found itself in the grips of an economic and political crisis, which brought about the decline of all fields of culture, including philosophy. In philosophy this crisis became manifest in the emergence of different idealist doctrines directed against materialism. One of them was the so-called Neo-Platonism founded by Plotinus (204-270) who started his philosophical school in Rome in 244 A.D. Basing himself on Plato's doctrine of the primacy of the world of ideas and the secondary nature of the material world, Plotinus developed his philosophy in the vein of religious mysticism.

According to him, the single divine beginning was the eternal basis and source of reality. Plotinus taught that, due to its self-repletion, the divine beginning gave off all the riches of the Universe, from things spiritual to things material, similar to the way the Sun emitted light.

Subsequently, Neo-Platonism and the religious philosophy of Plotinus served as a main source of medieval theology and scholasticism. The latter was the dominant theological and philosophical school of the Middle Ages and early Renaissance, whose representatives sought to substantiate theoretically the religious world outlook. The Italian theologian Thomas Aquinas (13th cent.), who argued that God was primary and the nature secondary, was one of the prominent scholastics. He used philosophical tenets to prove that philosophy was subservient to theology and also to strengthen the positions of the Church. In its turn the clergy, who exercized not only spiritual but also political power, persecuted scientists, especially those who advocated materialist ideas, put them to prisons, subjected them to torture and burned them alive. All this could not but tell on the development of materialism.

## Metaphysical Materialism

In the 17th and 18th centuries materialism was developed further. One prerequisite for the development of materialism was a rise in productive forces due to the establishment of capitalist production relations in Western Europe (in the 16th and 17th centuries), a growing need for more scientific knowledge for the purposes of production, navigation, etc.

The materialists of the period advocated the need for a resolute departure from meekly accepting scholastical postulates while proclaiming their faith in the greatness of human mind.

The prominent materialist philosophers of the time included; in Britain, Francis Bacon (1561-1626), Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), and John Locke (1632-1704); in Holland, B. Spinoza (1632-1677) and others; in France, J. O. Lamettrie (1709-1751), D. Diderot (1713-1784), C. A. Helvetius (1715-1771), and P. A. Holbach (1723-1789).

For all the divergency of their views and the wide range of problems tackled, they all expressed profound thoughts on the material nature of the Universe and its evolution.

Yet, since the science of the time had made most success in the study of the laws of mechanics, materialists relied exclusively on these laws to explain all processes and phenomena, including the cognition of the human body and social life.

This made the materialism of that period a mechanistic one. The acceptance of only one form of movement, the mechanistic one, and underdevelopment of natural science prevented them from studying the other forms and from reflecting reality scientifically; that made their materialism metaphysical. They also failed to offer a scientific explanation of the laws of social development, the lack of which markedly limits the value of any philosophy.

Still, a significant role played by materialism in the life of society at that time has to be pointed out. Suffice it to say that the newly emerging bourgeoisie capitalized on the tenets of materialism (when this was to its advantage) to increase the number of its supporters and to raise them to the struggle against feudalism. Materialism was the most important weapon in bourgeois revolutions in Europe.

In spite of the fact that philosophical advances were limited in value due to their failure to offer a genuinely scientific solution to the problem of development of nature, society and thinking, they still had an important role to play in the development of materialism in general and contributed to the emergence of a geniunely scientific philosophy.

## 2. Conditions of and Prerequisites for Materialism Turning into a Science

The emergence of scientific materialism was also caused by a number of factors besides those mentioned above. It was primarily due to further development of material production and to the aggravation of contradictions brought forth by private property.

### Socio-Economic Prerequisites for Scientific Materialism

Capitalism attained a high level of development of production in a number of countries in Europe by the early 19th century; it also revealed its deficiencies more vividly. As capitalist production grew, contradictions inherent in the very nature of the bourgeois system became more profound. It was already in 1825 that the first economic crisis hit the most developed European countries, with a general European industrial crisis occurring in 1847-1848. The crises caused a rapid deterioration of the situation of workers; this, in turn, led to a more acute class struggle, and to a resolute resistance by workers to capitalists. Suffice it to recall the actions by weavers in Lyons, France, in 1831 and 1834, whose slogan was, "To live working or to die fighting", the uprising of weavers in Silesia, Germany, suppressed in a bloodbath by the bourgeoisie, and the Chartist movement in Britain which was also crushed by the bourgeoisie, to grasp the genuine essence of the socio-economic environment of the developing bourgeois society at that time.

In the struggle against the bourgeoisie, the working class lacked organization and, more important, a clear class consciousness and an awareness of ways and means of destroying the capitalist system. It felt an acute need for a theory explaining its position in society and pointing to the ways of its social emancipation, a theory free of metaphysical one-sidedness and idealistic limitations. It was the philosophy of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels that became such a theory of the emancipation of the working class.

### Theoretical Sources of Scientific Materialism

In the situation, idealist philosophers were doing everything possible to obscure and conceal the exacerbated contradictions while propagating the ideas of non-cognizability of the world. Their activities were aimed at discrediting materialism, reducing its influence on social consciousness and undermining it. In the process, they made good use of weaknesses of metaphysical materialism and of the experience of its criticism by idealists in the past.

Already early idealists, in their attempts to exaggerate the role of consciousness, the soul, borrowed certain elements of dialectics from materialists and ascribed the highest and noblest qualities to these "spiritual substances", including sensitivity, "finest movements", changeability, etc.

Georg Hegel (1770-1831) was a prominent German philosopher who played an enormous role in the development of the dialectical theory of development. His philosophy was basically idealistic. He held that an absolute idea, existing outside and independently of man, rather than matter, was the basis and essence of the Universe. The "absolute idea" advanced by Hegel is nothing but human consciousness itself, albeit detached from man and promoted to the status of a supra-natural Demiurge (the Creator). In the final analysis, this Hegel's theoretical concept served the purposes of defending idealism.

True, while zealously defending idealism, Hegel did advance some valid ideas, which have always been valued by materialists. What is meant here is that, without suspecting it, he discovered and formulated the basic laws of universal development.

All of the laws and his idea of development, however, were presented by him in a form which turned the truth upside down. According to Hegel, what develops is not the real world but the "absolute idea".

The social contradictions generated by the relations of private property, the hypocrisy, the demagoguery, and the sophistry of idealists were certain to be met with indignation by materialists and to stimulate their efforts in the struggle against the idealists.

An outstanding role in the development of materialism and denunciation of idealism was played by German philosopher Ludwig Feuerbach (1804-1872). Initially a supporter of Hegel's idealism, he became a vocal adherent of materialism as he studied its preceding development.

The world is nothing but material nature, Feuerbach held. It exists independently of consciousness, has not been created by anyone, and is its own cause (*causa sui*). Movement is a form of existence of matter and is fully subject to the laws of physics. The world is cognizable, and the five human senses are quite sufficient to reflect the surrounding world. Feuerbach was sharply critical of idealism, and especially of Hegel for his "ingenious" attempts to demonstrate the existence and development of the non-existent absolute idea.

This caused Feuerbach to underestimate Hegel's dialectics and to reject it as part of Hegel's idealism. This wrought a serious deficiency in Feuerbach's materialism. Nor was Feuerbach able to advance in understanding social life. On this question he essentially remained on idealist positions.

Still, Feuerbach's philosophy is rightly described as crowning the development of the entire pre-Marxian materialist philosophy in Western Europe. His works, like the achievements of classical German philosophy, had as a whole an enormous influence on Marx and Engels during the period of the formation of their outlook.

A significant contribution to the development of materialist philosophy was made by Russian revolutionary democrats V. G. Belinsky (1811-1848), A. I. Herzen (1812-1870), and N. G. Chernyshevsky (1828-1889). They made an attempt to combine a materialist approach to nature with dialectics and advanced quite a few original ideas concerning social development.

The background for the emergence of dialectical materialist philosophy also included the development of some social sciences, and in particular of English political economy and French utopian socialism.

English political economy was founded by Adam Smith (1723-1790) and David Ricardo (1772-1823). Unlike their predecessors who studied primarily the processes of exchange and distribution, they concentrated on the role of production in the life of society and demonstrated that production is the decisive economic sphere and the main source of material benefits, and hence the source of progress. Their theory on the decisive role of labour in social life prompted researchers to look for the laws of this relationship, the laws of social development and a materialist understanding of history, and contributed to the emergence of a scientific philosophy.

Utopian socialism is the sum total of social theories which in yet immature forms reflected a desire for the establishment of a new type of society where there is no exploitation of man by man and no other forms of social inequality. The most prominent utopian socialists were English humanist and thinker Thomas Moore (1478-1535), Italian thinker Tommaso Campanella (1568-1639), French priest Jean Meslier (1664-1729), French thinkers Saint-Simon (1760-1825) and Charles Fourier (1772-1837), Robert Owen (1771-1858) in Britain, Russian writers A. I. Herzen, N. G. Chernyshevsky, and others. They were all opposed to the social system of exploitation and especially to the capitalist order, since the replacement of feudalism by capitalism, instead of improving the situation of the working masses, merely led to the entrenchment of a new system of oppression and exploitation. Utopian socialists, however, were incapable to scientifically substantiate the need for the transition to a new social system and were unaware of the laws of such transition.

Still, their criticism of capitalism and the spreading of new principles of social formation played an outstanding role in establishing the basis for future improvements of the theory.

The founders of dialectical materialist philosophy valued greatly the work by utopian socialists,as well as that by the representatives of British bourgeois political economy, and believed that they would not have been able to elaborate their own philosophy were it not for these sources.

## Three Great Discoveries in Natural Science

A decisive role in the affirmation of a dialectical and materialist approach to nature was played by *three great discoveries* in natural science—the discovery of the law of the conservation and transformation of energy by M. V. Lomonosov (1711-1765), A. Lavoisier (1743-1794) and J. Mayer (1814-1878); of the cellular structure of living organisms by M. Schleiden (1804-1881) and Th. Schwann (1810-1882); and the creation of the theory of evolution by Ch. Darwin (1809-1882). The discoveries led one to the conclusion that nothing in the world ceases to exist, with everything moving from one state to another, and that the Universe is eternal and infinite. Thus preceding theories concerning the eternal existence of nature, its movement and change advanced by ancient materialists were substantiated scientifically. The explanation offered by the theory of the cell consisted in that cells of plants, animals, man and of all life forms in general had the same structure and the same physiological functions. This, in turn, was the best demonstration of the unity of life forms.

Finally, Darwin's theory offered a scientific explanation and proof of the variability of plant and animal species, and of their common origins. The development of fauna and flora, including the emergence of man, is nothing but an uninterrupted process of their adaptation to a changing environment as a consequence of special conditions of the struggle for survival.

All of the above became the scientific basis for the emergence of a dialectical materialist approach to nature and man.

Thus, the emergence of a scientific, dialectical materialist philosophy has been made possible through a set of different factors and objective circumstances. Of primary importance among these are:

1. The development of materialism in different countries, including the countries of the Orient, over an extended period of time (about two and a half thousand years);
2. Socio-economic conditions related to the contradictions of capitalist society, which make class struggle more acute and require a solution by means of, among others, sociological theory;
3. Development of classical German philosophy, English bourgeois political economy and French utopian socialism;
4. The three great discoveries in natural science.

Consequently, dialectical materialist philosophy was not a fantasy with no substantiation in reality; nor was it something that emerged independently of the development of civilization. It was prepaired by the entire development of natural history, of which it is a consequence.

It was brought to life by the need to answer the questions posed by advanced thinkers; as you will see below, it does provide answers to these questions.

## 3. The Emergence of a Dialectical Materialist Philosophy and Its Radical Distinction from the Preceding Philosophy

### A Scientific Philosophy Is Founded by Marx, Engels and Lenin

Dialectical materialist philosophy was founded by German philosophers and economists, great teachers and leaders of the working class, Karl Marx (1818-1883) and Frederick Engels (1820-1895). It was further developed in the works by the Russian philosopher, economist, statesman and founder of the first socialist state in the world, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin (1870-1924).

As pointed out above, the creation of dialectical materialist philosophy was prepared by the entire course of social development. Still, men of genius were required to generalize and reassess everything hitherto created by the world civilization in the spiritual sphere, to take into account the latest advances of science, to respond to the social environment and to use all of the above for the benefit of the working classes. These men also had to be able to understand the needs of the people, to come to its defence and to devote their whole lives to this cause. Those men of genius were Marx, Engels and Lenin.

In his defence of workers, and primarily of peasants, the young Marx was motivated by social injustices, the suffering of many of his compatriots and greediness and cupidity of property owners. As editor of the *Rheinische Zeitung* (1842-1848), he witnessed elementary human rights being trampled underfoot in the name of the interests of men of property. He resolutely rose to the defence of the poor, politically and socially underprivileged masses. As he did so, he did not limit himself to denunciation and criticism of the existing social order; he began looking for causes of the social injustices and to analyze the contradictions of social reality. Thus, Marx became aware of the role of economic interests in relations among men, and of the material basis for social inequality and class struggle. In other words, an analysis of economic relations enabled Marx to discover the objective laws of social development and provide a materialist explanation of history, as well as to reveal the dependence of all social relations on the mode of production of material goods. The nature of social relations is dependent on the mode of production. The mode of production based on private property engenders social relations of exploitation.

While in Paris in August 1844, Marx met Engels whose ideological, political and philosophical outlook was the same.

Frederick Engels was the son of a wealthy manufacturer. In spite of this, he was able to discern the inhuman exploitation at factories and the hypocrisy of those who mercilessly exploited child labour with the sole purpose of saving on wages of adult workers. Poverty, disease and alcoholism among workers made the young Engels think of why this was taking place, of what were the root causes of social inequality and injustice, and of how they could be eliminated. He saw them as rooted in the existence of private property in the means of production.

While working at his father's factory in London (1842-1844), Engels witnessed the struggle of British proletariat for its rights, class conflicts between workers and factory owners which sometimes erupted in armed clashes with the police. The courage and heroism of workers displayed in the struggle left a lasting impression on Engels. He decided to take the side of workers in the struggle for their liberation.

Engels was a most active participant in the bourgeois revolution in Germany in 1848, fighting on the side of the army of insurgents.

The meeting of Marx and Engels, as well as the full coincidence of their views on the basic ideological, political and philosophical issues, resulted in their rapid and resolute departure from Hegel's idealist philosophy which they had both adhered to initially, and the beginning of their work on a scientific, dialectical materialist philosophy under the influence of Feuerbach's materialism. In the article "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law. Introduction" (1844), Marx for the first time revealed the historic role of the proletariat as the revolutionary class capable of transforming the world.

At the same time (1844-1845) Engels completes his book *The Condition of the Working-Class in England.* In this study of the origins of industrial proletariat and its progressive impoverishment, he illustrates its historic role in the elimination of capitalism. Engels's studies demonstrated the need for a united proletariat, an independent class with interests and principles of its own, opposed to bourgeois interests and bourgeois ideology.

The first work written jointly by Marx and Engels, *The Holy Family*, contains a profound criticism of Hegel's philosophical system. The work demonstrates that a society based on the principles of social equality is a logical corollary of materialist, rather than idealist, philosophy.

Nevertheless, they held Hegel's dialectics in high regard, while finding serious faults with Feuerbach's materialism. Already in the "Theses on Feuerbach", Marx reveals the basic deficiency of all preceding materialism, which is its contemplative nature and failure to comprehend the role of practice in the process of cognition and transformation of the Universe. Philosophers of the past did find faults with the social world (*society*) and did criticize it, yet they put up with it. The task, however, was to change the world (society) for the better.

The second joint work by Marx and Engels, *The German Ideology* (1845-1846), mostly deals with the questions of historical materialism; it was here that the idea of the need for proletariat to gain political power for its total emancipation was advanced for the first time.

Later Marx and Engels wrote dozens of other works of enormous importance for the development of scientific communism, dialectical and historical materialism and scientific political economy. Among them are *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (1848), by Marx and Engels, *The Class Struggle in France. 1848-1850, The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, Capital, The Civil War in France, Critique of the Gotha Programme* and others written by Marx; and *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, Anti-Dühring, The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy* and others written by Engels. These works caused a genuine revolution in philosophy. Materialism became a science and the only scientific trend in philosophy, that of dialectical materialism.

## The Essence of the Revolution in Philosophy

What is the relation of the philosophical outlook of Marx and Engels to previous materialism and to all the preceding philosophy? What is the essence of the revolution they brought about in philosophy? An answer to these questions reveals the new elements introduced by them in philosophy and the difference between their theories and the preceding philosophical systems.

1. First and foremost, Marx and Engels creatively reassessed all that was valuable in the preceding development of philosophical thinking and created a new form of materialism, free of the drawbacks of previous materialist philosophy, mechanicism and metaphysics. In particular, they fused dialectics and materialism into a single and indivisible whole, created dialectical materialism and materialist dialectics (opposed to Hegel's idealist dialectics). Marx and Engels replaced a mechanistic approach to nature and man by a theory on development laws embracing all spheres of non-organic nature, the organic world, social life and human consciousness.

This, however, does not mean, as opponents of Marxism sometimes attempt to "prove", that Marx and Engels simply joined Feuerbach's materialism and Hegelian dialectics together. In fact, the two doctrines, Feuerbach's metaphysical materialism and Hegel's idealistic dialectics, are impossible to join together. "My dialectic method," Marx wrote, "is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite. To Hegel, the life-process of the human brain, *i.e.*, the process of thinking, which, under the name of 'the Idea', he even transforms into an independent subject, is the demiurgos of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of 'the Idea'.

With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought."[1]

2. The classics of Marxism created a gnoseology (a theory of cognition) based on entirely new principles. They were the first to predicate the concept of the cognizability of the world on the primacy of being and social practice, rather than that of the idea, as with Hegel. It is in practice, Marx wrote, that man must prove the genuineness, i.e. the validity, power and relevance of his thinking.

3. Marx and Engels were the first to extend materialism to the understanding of social life, as they came to the conclusion that in society, too, the material, and in particular the material conditions of life, is primary, while social consciousness, social theories and different outlooks are secondary. These ideas are a reflection of the material life of men and of material conditions of their existence.

Hence the requirements of dialectical materialist philosophy—in the evaluation of a social event or the solution of a practical problem, one must be guided by objective conditions and material possibilities, rather than by subjective desires or wishes. In other words, Marx and Engels discovered a materialist understanding of human history, the motive forces and laws of social development, thus turning social theory into a science—*historical* materialism.

4. By creating historical materialism, Marx and Engels also revolutionized the approach to war as a social phenomenon, as they revealed its genuine nature and essence. In particular, they established an organic link between military theory, war and army and the development of the mode of production, productive forces and production relations. With this as a point of departure, they expressed many a profound idea on ways of organizing armies, on military science, combat training and troop morale.

5. With the emergence of dialectical materialist philosophy, the social role of philosophy was changed—from a theory attempting to explain the world in one manner or another, it became the science of transforming the world, changing it.

6. The dialectical materialist philosophy elaborated by Marx and Engels became the world outlook of the working class and of all the working masses. Previously, even the most advanced philosophical doctrines ands systems were far removed from the working masses; the new philosophy became the first philosophy of the oppressed and the world outlook of the working classes. Using the words of Marx, one might say that as philosophy finds its material weapon in the working masses, so do the working masses find their spiritual weapon in philosophy. Marx and Engels placed philosophy at the service of man's

---

[1] Karl Marx, *Capital,* Vol. 1, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 29.

practice, made it a method of revolutionary activities. It was not accidental that Marx, Engels and Lenin were not just theoreticians; they were also actively involved in practical work, established the Communist Party, and directed the class struggle by the working masses.

As opposed to bourgeois philosophical doctrines, whose authors conceal their relationship with the interests of predominant classes, the proponents of the dialectical materialist philosophy openly acknowledge that their doctrine belongs to working masses and is based on party principles. Characteristic of the party spirit of the philosophy is the fact that, as opposed to the party spirit of bourgeois philosophy, it is not in contradiction with scientific principles, as the interests of the working class are not opposed to, but coincide with, the natural course of history. The vitality of the philosophy is due to its truthfulness and genuineness.

7. As opposed to pre-Marxian philosophical systems with their claims to expressing the absolute and final truth, i.e. to containing knowledge that will never change, dialectical materialist philosophy holds that its theory is bound to be made more accurate and to be enriched with the development of science and social practice.

Dialectical materialist philosophy is a profoundly creative science which is alien to all dogmatism.

## Lenin's Contribution to the Development of Dialectical Materialist Philosophy

The creative nature of Marxist philosophy has found its confirmation in its elaboration and enrichment by Lenin. Like Marx and Engels, Lenin devoted his entire life to the cause of liberation of the working classes. He joined the revolutionary movement at the age of seventeen, was repeatedly arrested by the tzarist government, sent to exile, and he was compelled to live abroad for many years. He always combined revolutionary activities with work on theoretical problems of philosophy, political economy and scientific socialism. Some of his outstanding works are, *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats; The Development of Capitalism in Russia; What Is to Be Done? ; One Step Forward, Two Steps Back; Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution; The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905-1907; Materialism and Empirio-Criticism; The Right of Nations to Self-Determination; Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism; War and Revolution; The State and Revolution; Left-Wing Communism—an Infantile Disorder.*

The emergence of Leninism as a new stage in the development of

Marxist philosophy was caused by specific historical circumstances. The first was the advent of a new era, the era of imperialism and socialist revolutions; the second, the latest discoveries made by natural science at the turn of the 20th century, and the third, the enormous influence of Marxism on all aspects of life. Lenin's greatest contribution was his generalization of the latest discoveries in natural science and his analysis of new socio-economic phenomena followed by a further development of the philosophical doctrine elaborated by Marx and Engels. It would indeed be difficult to name a philosophical problem which was not taken a step further in works by Lenin. Mentioned below are but the most important of these.

1. Lenin succeeded in defending Marx and Engels's philosophy from attacks by all kinds of opportunists, primarily those who opposed a revolutionary liberation of workers from exploitation, and by all kind of revisionists, primarily subjective idealists led by Austrian philosopher Mach (Machists) and their followers in Russia.

In *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* (1909) Lenin convincingly demonstrated the fallacy of Machism, and revealed its class essence aimed at the defence of exploiters.

2. Lenin comprehensively elaborated Marx's theory on matter and consciousness as a reflection of reality; he developed the materialist theory of cognition further and on this basis proved that human conscience is active and creative by nature and that, besides reflecting the world, it also transforms it. The entire world recognizes now that Lenin was the first thinker of this century who was able to perceive the beginnings of a great scientific revolution in the achievements of natural science of the time, who succeeded in revealing and generalizing in philosophical terms the revolutionary significance of fundamental discoveries made by great natural scientists. He offered a profound philosophical interpretation of new scientific data at the time of a radical reassessment of fundamental principles in the leading natural sciences. The idea on the inexhaustibility of matter which he advanced became a principle of cognition in natural science.

3. Special credit is due to Lenin for the theoretical elaboration of problems of historical materialism in their application to a new historical era in the life of mankind: a) he provided a comprehensive analysis of the relationship between social being and social consciousness, between material and ideological relations; b) having discovered the law of uneven economic and political development under imperialism and relying on the law, he showed that imperialism is the last stage of capitalism, the eve of a socialist revolution whose triumph is possible and inevitable, at the initial stage, in a number of countries or even in one individual country; c) on this basis, Lenin worked out a theory of socialist revolution and substantiated the need for its protection by military means; d) Lenin enriched Marx's theory

on the role of popular masses in history, on proletarian dictatorship, on the role of the working classes and their parties as the vanguard and leader of the socialist revolution; e) Lenin is also credited with envisaging the possibility of non-capitalist development and of transition to socialism by individual countries and peoples bypassing the capitalist stage of development. He considered a triumphant socialist revolution in individual advanced countries and the provision by them of an all-round assistance to other peoples to be the most important prerequisite for such a transition.

4. Lenin substantiated and developed the party principle of philosophy, the creative nature of Marxist philosophical science.

Lenin's contribution to Marxist theory is important enough to justify the description of the theory created by Marx and Engels as Marxism-Leninism, and of its theoretical basis, dialectical and historical materialism, as Marxist-Leninist philosophy.

5. Lenin also made a creative contribution in the development of a materialist theory on war. He defined the social criteria and the types of war at the current stage. These objective criteria assist progressive forces in the elaboration of a correct military policy, in determining their attitude to each specific war, including the wars forced upon developing countries by imperialist circles.

An entire revolutionary era in the history of mankind is linked to the name and activities of Lenin. Social practice in its entirety has vindicated his doctrine. His theory of socialist revolution was confirmed by the practice of the Great October Socialist Revolution, as well as by revolutions in other countries, including newly liberated ones. His thesis on the leading role of the proletariat in the building of a society devoid of enslavement and exploitation found its reflection, besides the establishment of such a society in the USSR, also in a number of other countries, including some in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Lenin's conclusions and propositions concerning national liberation movements of oppressed peoples and the possibility of their transition to socialism bypassing capitalism are of an inestimable importance for the peoples of developing states.

The creative development of dialectical materialist philosophy begun by Lenin (the Leninist stage) still continues.

The philosophy is being developed primarily by joint efforts of workers' parties and their outstanding representatives, prominent Marxist philosophers in socialist, capitalist and developing countries. In socialist-oriented liberated countries dialectical materialist philosophy is being popularized and developed in its application to the specific social transformations underway in these countries by leading party and state figures.

## 4. Dialectical Materialist Philosophy: Its Subject Matter, Purpose and Role

### The Subject Matter of Dialectical Materialist Philosophy

With the emergence of Marxist-Leninist philosophy the content and purpose of philosophical knowledge were no longer the same. It is not merely the world in general that is the object (subject matter) of cognition by dialectical materialist philosophy, but the most general laws of the world. Thus, current materialist philosophy is more than a system of views on the world, man and society; it is a science dealing with the most general laws of nature, society and thinking. It has become a science since it has its own specific laws as the object of study. Lacking this, no system of knowledge would be a science.

Inasmuch as dialectical materialist philosophy is an inalienable unity of materialism and dialectics, it is concerned both with laws studied by materialism and those studied by dialectics.

A basic law of materialism, for instance, is that reflecting the permanent relationship of primacy of matter and the secondary nature of consciousness and the law of the determining role of social being with respect to social consciousness, etc.

Dialectics is concerned with the most general laws of development and causal connections. Among these, as seen below, are the law of the struggle and unity of opposites, the law of mutual transition of qualitative and quantitative transformations, the law of negation of the negation, etc. To facilitate a study of these laws, dialectical materialist philosophy is divided into two parts. The part dealing with the most general laws of nature and thinking is called dialectical materialism, while that concerned with the most general social laws, historical materialism.

Now, bourgeois (idealist) philosophy is a different matter altogether. It denies the law-governed development of nature and society and the possibility of their cognition. It merely expresses its attitude to the world in general while describing the latter in false terms. Consequently, it is not the laws of nature, society and thinking that form its subject but a vague set of questions concerning the creation of the world and man, the impossibility of cognizing them, the fallacy of materialism, etc. *It is not, therefore, a science.* Idealism is no more than a trend which has branched out of the *mainstream of philosophical knowledge* and is becoming outdated, while dialectical materialist philosophy is the core of the mainstream.

If, having said this, one goes back to the earlier questions of which philosophy to study and which to oppose, these questions become self-explanatory. Only a scientific philosophy is worth studying. An unscientific philosophy is the direct opposite of the scientific one, and its very nature is alien to the scientific philosophy. Therefore, all those who believe in science and support the use of scientific knoweldge, should oppose the unscientific philosophy while exposing the gimmicks it uses in defence of exploiting classes and its treacherous struggle with progressive forces.

## Purposes and Functions of Dialectical Materialist Philosophy

What goals, then, does dialectical materialist philosophy pursue?

Primarily, these include a profound cognition of the most general laws of nature, society and thinking; the elaboration of scientific principles and ways of the use thereof in human practice; based on the knowledge of these laws and their effect, and on an explanation of various processes and phenomena caused by them, helping people to acquire a scientific comprehension of the Universe and a scientific world outlook. Those who are profoundly aware of the essence of things and know the grass roots of various phenomena are free of fear and prejudice, and are capable of transforming reality actively and courageously.

Since dialectical materialist philosophy helps all those who study it cognize the world and acquire a correct outlook, it is sometimes said to have a *theoretical-cognitive and outlook-formative role.* The goals of dialectical materialist philosophy include, besides helping people understand the world in scientific terms and become capable of transforming it, the elaboration of the methods and principles of such a transformation. It could be seen as providing basic methods and approaches for the solution of problems facing man; it is a methodological basis of man's diverse practical activities.

Further, dialectical materialist philosophy, on the one hand, embraces all the most valuable knowledge and the cultural heritage accumulated over many thousands of years, and on the other, examines the values on a genuinely scientific basis; i.e., it has an educational and cultural role to play.

Thus, dialectical materialist philosophy is a science no one can do without.

## Scientific Philosophy and Special Sciences

Dialectical materialist philosophy rejects philosophy in the old meaning of the word.

It is a rejection of the *opposition* of philosophical theory and practice inherent in previous philosophy, and of philosophical theory to specialized natural and social sciences, which were regarded by the previous philosophy as knowledge of a lower order. In other words, dialectical materialist philosophy is no longer the passive contemplative philosophy of the past; it aims at changing and transforming the world in accordance with scientific requirements. Unlike the previous philosophy, it has no claims to the role of the so-called "science of sciences" and does not regard its scientific theory as a system of absolute truths established once and for all times. Philosophy cannot and should not be an "absolute science" claiming to solve all problems. Specific aspects of the Universe are the subject of specialized sciences. While specialized sciences (e.g., physics, chemistry, history, law, etc.) deal with individual and specific laws pertaining to individual spheres of the objective world, philosophy studies the most general laws effective in all the spheres. The role and place of philosophy within the system of scientific knoweldge can be compared to those of a scientist who, from a mountain top, observes everything below—houses, streets, and the general outlay of a town—and yet does not discern small details. And this is not because he is an ignoramus or a man of superficial learning; details are the concern of other sciences. The physical structure of buildings is the concern of a physicist, paint composition that of a chemist, etc. As far as philosophy is concerned, on the basis of conclusions and recommendations made by specialized sciences, it shows the general outlay, the general structure of the world under study.

No specific theory can be complete without a background in the general theory of an issue or lacking an introduction in general theory. A specialized researcher working in a specific field of knowledge and ignoring philosophical theory is like a mole who, as its work progresses and the burrow becomes deeper, sees nothing in front and even less behind. Dialectical materialist philosophy reveals the underlying causes of wars on a scientific basis while exposing the true war-mongers to peoples. It holds that wars are unleashed by the exploiting classes who resort to wars each time they fail to get economic gains in international affairs by means of peaceful policy and diplomacy.

The following conclusions will summarize the above.

Materialism as a philosophical system plays an important role in the life of society. The efforts of many generations of materialist philosophers of many countries and peoples were required for it to become of value from the standpoint of science, world outlook, methodology, and socio-political point of view.

From its first historical form, that of primitive materialism, and passing through the mechanistic and metaphysical materialism of the 17th and 18th centuries, materialist philosophy gradually evolved into its highest dialectical, materialist and scientific form.

The scientific dialectical materialist philosophy was created in the mid-19th century by Marx and Engels, to be developed further by Lenin. They generalized the entire history of development of philosophical knowledge, utilized the best philosophical achievements of all times, by all countries and peoples, to refine them and on this basis, taking into account an analysis of the contemporary social practice and achievements by other sciences, to elaborate a new philosophy. Their contribution to the transformation was so important that the new philosophy they elaborated was rightfully called Marxist-Leninist.

Dialectical materialist philosophy has never ceased to develop. Contemporary progressive forces are facing important tasks as regards its more profound study and more effective utilization in their efforts to improve social relations and eliminate exploitation and enslavement of oppressed peoples.

*Test Questions*

1. Which kinds of materialism do you know?
2. Who are the most prominent materialist philosophers of Antiquity, of the 17th-19th centuries, and of the present time?
3. What is the essence of the revolutionary transformations brought about in philosophy by Marx, Engels and Lenin?
4. What does dialectical materialist philosophy study?
   What is its subject matter and goals?

*Chapter III*

# DIALECTICAL MATERIALIST PHILOSOPHY ON THE ESSENCE OF THE WORLD AND THE FORMS OF ITS EXISTENCE

## 1. What Does the World Represent? What Is Matter?

### General Concepts of the World Around Us

The question of what is the essence of the world around us is a most ancient, complicated and yet urgent one. What does the world represent? What forms its underlying basis?

Scientists approached the question from different angles and from various methodological positions. Yet, what seemed to be incontrovertible truths established once and for all were inevitably nullified by new discoveries—the outside world was much too diverse in its manifestations.

Protracted controversies on the issue resulted, essentially, in two opposite approaches, the idealistic and the materialistic ones.

What was the reasoning of idealists, and in particular, of Plato (427-347 B.C.), an early idealist, who considered this problem? As an illustration, let us take an object in our environment, like a table. There are different kinds of tables; a table can fall apart and cease to exist. Yet the concept of a table, or what the word "table" represents, i.e. common elements of all tables, the "idea" of a table, remains indestructible and unchanged. Thus, Plato reasoned, nothing but ideas exists really firmly and eternally, while objects corresponding to the ideas change, fall apart and deteriorate as they are no more than poor imitations or material embodiments of the ideas, no more than pale shadows of the great bright world of ideas. This caused Plato, followed by other idealists, to consider that the world around us and the processes therein are nothing but poor imitations, flawed and faulty copies of the perfect world of ideas. Plato, as well as all idealists, failed to notice that the very concept of the "idea" or a table resulted from a reflection of a real multitude of tables made by man to meet practical requirements. If, for example, no houses existed in reality, there would be no concept of a "house" either. The concept of an "airplane", for one, appeared only after the invention of the airplane. Prior to it, when man thought about flying he had in his mind something similar to the concept of a bird, another reflection of reality, this time of birds.

Thus, if we follow the idealists' reasoning and attempt to determine the essence of the world around us, not only shall we fail to find the true solution of the problem; the results we shall achieve will be false and distorted. An example is Hegel's philosophy already mentioned here.

In other words, thoughts and ideas which reality forms in the human mind are regarded by idealists not only as independent but also as of primary importance; they are regarded as the absolute essence of nature, man and history. Thus, the real and genuine world we live in becomes an illusory world not worthy of our attention, study and caring for; the real world is replaced by a new idol born out of human thinking and imagination, the idol which, besides, is beyond cognition. Understandably, the answers offered by the idealists to the question of the essence of the world can not be considered acceptable.

Materialists took a different approach to the question. While not denying the importance of ideas and concepts in the determination of the structure and essence of the world, they began by rejecting the existence of a spiritual origin of the world. Then they concentrated all their efforts on studying primarily the real and observable world. Thales, for one, already attempted to determine the structure of the Universe and the positioning of celestial bodies, the Moon, the Sun and the stars, vis-à-vis the Earth. He saw the Earth as a flat disc floating on water, with stars closest to, and the Sun fartherest from it. In any case, he never doubted the objective existence of the world, whose essence he related to the existence of a liquid foundation, water.

Anaximander, like his teacher Thales, also dealt with the structure of the world and its essence. To Anaximander, the Earth resembles a cylinder or a column, and the sky is a sphere or a globe around it. The Earth emerged out of a primary substance, which could not be one of the definite substances known to man, like water [illegible] other substance. It was something indefinite. The idenfinite primary substance had no limits; hence its description as "apeiron", "the unlimited".

According to Anaximander, layers of water and air emerged out of the primary substance around the Earth in the process of world formation. All the substances separated from the "unlimited" primary substance had to return to it after a period of time. This causes the emergence and destruction of the worlds.

Anaximenes, Anaximander's disciple, also developed the materialistic approach to the world. Yet, according to Anaximenes, neither Anaximander's "unlimited", nor Thales' "water" could be the primary substance. To explain the essence of the surrounding world, Anaximenes held, one had to explain the *process* by means of which natural objects and things had to emerge out of the primary substance. This process becomes understandable if air is taken to be the primary substance. It is air that is characterized by the processes of rarefication and condensation leading to the formation of all substances. If rarefied, air becomes fire; if condensed, it becomes, depending on the degree of condensation, water, then earth, and finally stone. All substances can be of various forms and particles can be combined by various ways of rarefication and condensation effective everywhere.

Materialist philosophers went further than merely stating the natural character of the surrounding world; they also noted interrelationships and mutual transition of one state of objects and processes into others, and the existence of a universal essence underlying the world. As noted above, Heraclitus spoke of a transient and changing nature of all being, saying that any object or property did not change just anyhow, but became their opposites, the cold turning into the warm, the wet into the dry, the dry into the wet, etc. The Sun itself changes every moment. With the opposites turning into each other, the underlying basis is preserved while their properties change.

Profound thoughts on the essence of the surrounding world were expressed by Anaxagoras, Democritus, Aristotle, Epicurus, Lucretius Carus and others. Anaxagoras stated unequivocally that the Earth and the Sun were material bodies, while Democritus held that the entire world consisted only of atoms and a vacuum. The existence of colour is only a matter of general opinion, as well as the bitter or the sweet. In reality, however, nothing exists but atoms and a vacuum. Aristotle remarked that atoms are what all things are composed of, what they emerge of and what they finally turn into. More, Aristotle, who rejected Plato's claims that the essence of things is a reflection of ideas, stressed the existence of things as such. Essence, accoridng to Aristotle, is each individual thing: an animal, a plant, water, this Universe and its parts, the stars, the Moon and the Sun. Describing the structure of the world, Aristotle remarked that it is composed of four "elements"—earth, water, air and fire, while all objects existing on Earth were born out of the mixture thereof. The elements of water and earth naturally tend to gravitate towards the center of the world ("down"), while fire and air move "up". The Earth is thus located in the centre of the world, with water, air and fire above. The fifth element, ether, is situated from the Moon and above, making movement, which has neither beginning nor end, eternal.

Epicurus followed Aristotle in rejecting idealists' claims. He held that nothing is born out of the non-existent, that the Universe has always been the same because there is nothing into which it can change, or is changing, since there is nothing besides the Universe which could enter it and introduce changes. The Universe and all its diverse phenomena consist of atoms moving in a vacuum. Both the number of atoms and the vacuum are unlimited, making the Universe unlimited.

Lucretius Carus held similar views. Besides never doubting the real and material existence of the world, he offered a brilliant elaboration of the idea of a multitude of worlds already advanced by Democritus.

Profound ideas on the structure of the Universe were elaborated by Hipparchus (90-125 A.D.) and Ptolemy (90-160 A.D.). Hipparchus was the first to make systematic sky observations. He worked out a theory and compiled tables of movement of the Sun and the Moon, he also made quite an accurate assessment of the distance from the Earth to the Moon. Hipparchus compiled what was by the standards of the time a huge catalogue of positions of 850 stars, ranging by the brightness, and invented physical coordinates, latitude and longitude.

Ptolemy succeeded where all others before him had failed. He worked out a method of calculating the position of individual planets at any given moment in time. Ptolemy's calculations for a system of the world, however, contained a mistake–he thought that the world was centered around the Earth. Hence, his system is called geocentric (from Greek *geo*, the Earth).

For centuries no one could surpass the great thinker or find the error in his system. It was only about one and a half thousand years later that Polish materialist scientist Nicolaus Copernicus (1473-1543) succeeded in establishing the basis for a correct scientific outlook on the surrounding world. In *De revolutionibus orbium caelestium* he substantiated a new system of the world called Copernican or heliocentric (from Greek *helios,* the Sun). According to the theory, the world centres on the Sun. The Earth and the other planets revolve around the Sun in one direction, while rotating on one of their axes. Copernicus's idea was brilliantly substantiated and improved upon by the German scientist, Johannes Kepler (1571-1630). The laws of the planets' movement around the Sun discovered by him and the measurement of their speeds played a major historical role as the basis for further development of the theory; more, they anticipated the discovery of other universal laws (e.g., Newton's law of universal gravitation) leading in the future to a scientific view of the world in general. This became possible, however, only at the stage when materialism became a genuinely scientific philosophy, the philosophy of dialectical materialism.

## Scientific View of the World

Dialectical materialist philosophy makes its conclusions concerning the structure and essence of the surrounding world on the basis of current achievements of natural science, and in particular astronomy, the science of the Universe, as well as physics, chemistry, biology and other natural sciences. From the point of view of astronomy, the solar system is a system of celestial bodies moving in the field of the predominant gravitational influence of the Sun. The celestial bodies are taken to mean the Sun, the planets, the planets' satellites, comets, meteorites and space dust. The solar system has the following structure: it is centered around the Sun, a huge star which is a hot ball of plasma whose mass is 332,958 times that of the Earth. Nine major planets revolve around the Sun; the Earth is the third closest to it. Many planets have satellites. The Earth, for instance, has one satellite, the Moon; Mars has two, Jupiter twelve, Saturn ten, Uranus five, Neptune two. Besides, there are about two thousand smaller planets in the solar system, whose orbits lie mainly between those of Mars and Jupiter.

The solar system is governed by laws of its own. It is a system and not a random conglomeration of celestial bodies precisely because it is governed by certain laws. Here are some of the laws governing the round dance of the planets centered on the Sun: all the celestial bodies which are permanent elements of the solar system revolve around the Sun following elliptical orbits in such a manner that if a straight line is drawn between the Sun and a planet, the line would cover equal areas over equal periods of time, etc.

The solar system functions on the basis of laws because there are other, more general laws effective in the Universe, like the law of universal gravitation, the law of the conservation of energy and of matter, and others. The solar system is just one part of the world around us. It forms part of the Galaxy, which in turn is a part of the Metagalaxy, or of the eternal and unlimited Universe. The Galaxy (from the Greek *gala,* milk) is a vast stellar system which comprises the Sun and, consequently, our entire solar system, including the Earth. The Galaxy is composed of a multitude of stars of various types, as well as of stellar accumulations and associations, of gas and dust nebulae and of individual atoms scattered in space. The Galaxy is vast and can not be measured in conventional units of measurement applicable on Earth. Galaxies are measured in units based on the speed of light, like light hours and light years. There are distances which measure hundreds, thousands, millions and even billions of light years. The diameter of our Galaxy is one hundred thousand light years and its "thickness" twelve thousand light years. Within this space there are about 100 billion stars like the Sun. All the stars form a single dynamic system which rotates on the small axis. The solar system rotates with the Galaxy, moving along a circular orbit with the speed of about 250 kilometers per second. The period of the solar system's revolution around the center of the Galaxy is about 200 million years. Vast as the Galaxy is, however, it does not account for the entirety of the world. A multitude of Galaxies similar to this one exist next to it. Several billion Galaxies, millions and billions light years apart, can be seen through a modern telescope. The Universe has neither limits nor end. Nowhere is there anything which could be considered to be the world's end. Science supports the conclusions made by materialist philosophers concerning the indefinite and unlimited nature of the macro-world, complicated interrelationships and mutual causality within it and its law-governed movement.

The results of the study of the Earth and of the penetration by the human mind into the secrets of the micro-world are no less interesting. Like the results of the study of the macro-world, they support the basic hypotheses of materialists concerning the world's structure. For instance, people used to believe that the Earth was a convex island surrounded by oceans, while the inside of the Earth was held to be the kingdom of the dead. It was also claimed that the Earth was floating on top of three whales, or was supported by three elephants, etc.

Yet science has demonstrated that these ideas were naive, born as they were at a time when human knowledge was limited. They were propagated by those who based their conclusions on illusions, on fantasy with no basis in reality, instead of on an analysis of actual facts or achievements of science. Science began progressing because, consciously or unconsciously scientists adopted materialistic views. A study of real laws of the objective world, and not of a mythical "idea", "universal reason", spirit, etc., revealed the genuine nature of the Earth and the structure of the micro-world. As of today, science has determined the size, mass, chemical composition, structure and shape of the Earth.

The Earth is a planet of the solar system. Like the other planets of the system, it revolves around the Sun under the influence of its gravitation. As correctly assumed by materialist Heraklides Ponticus (388-315 B.C.) already at the time of Aristotle, the movement of the Earth is "a rotation on its axis, like a wheel, from the West to the East around its center". The period of rotation is one day.

Structurally, the Earth is a globe composed of several layers. The upper and most extensive layer is the magnetosphere, a space around the Earth whose physical properties are determined by the magnetic field and its interaction with currents of charged particles. Below it is the atmosphere, or the atmospheric layer, which forms a coat around the Earth of up to one thousand kilometers in depth.

The top layer of the Earth proper (i.e., of the "solid" Earth) consists of the hydrosphere and the Earth crust. The hydrosphere comprizes the World Ocean, ice and snow on land areas, rivers, lakes and swamps, and the water in the atmosphere and live organisms.

The crust consists of three layers, with the sedimentary layer (depth 0 to 20 km) on top, what is referred to as the granite layer (10 to 40 km deep) in the middle, and what is known as the basalt layer (10 to 70 km deep), isolated from the granite layer by the Conrad's surface, at the bottom. Underlying it is the thick layer of the mantle going down to the depth of 2,900 km, and under the mantle is the Earth's core which is 7 thousand kilometers in diameter.

The chemical composition of the Earth and of its environment is determined by a "set" of elements: iron, oxygen, silicon, magnesium, nickel, sulphur, calcium, aluminium, sodium, chromium, manganese, cobalt, phosphorus, potassium, titanium, and many others. According to the periodic table of elements compiled by D. M. Mendeleyev (1834-1907), the total number of elements was 106 as of 1975. Each chemical element is composed of a number of atoms with the same charge of the nucleus. Each atom, in turn, is composed of elementary particles–electrons, protons, neutrons, photons, pi-mesons, etc. Over 350 elementary particles have been discovered; structurally they are often composed of even smaller "genuine elementary particles".

The number of particles detected never ceases to increase as knowledge is accumulated. A most complicated diversity is created by the interaction of the particles; as they collide under different physical conditions they form new particles, various aggregate states of matter and cause mutual transitions of some types of matter into others.

If one accidentally drops a drinking glass, one does not expect it to break into several small cups. Neither do we expect an airplane to emerge out of a collision of two automobiles. In both cases we shall get only pieces or fragments of the things. Yet, in the micro-world, these transformations of a glass into cups and of cars into an airplane are nothing unusual. A neutron becomes a proton and an electron; a proton becomes a neutrino; the collision of an electron and a positron yields several photons, or light particles. If equal quantities of positive and negative ions (fragments of atoms) are concentrated under high temperatures, plasma is formed, which is a gaseous mixture and the basis of stellar formations. This means that elementary particles, if organized correctly, sufficient in number and in extremely high density can become stars. A synthesis reaction takes place in the nuclei of stars resulting in the formation of chemical elements in the order reflected in Mendeleyev's Periodical Table. Micro-objects are the basis of formation of macro-objects, while disintegration of the latter turns them into micro-objects, and vice versa, endlessly.

Thus, science has confirmed the conclusions reached by dialectical materialist philosophy concerning the inexhaustibility of the micro-world and the endless *mutual transition* of micro-elements into the macro-world and vice versa. Still, what do the micro-objects and macro-objects represent?

## The Concept of Matter

All the above macro- and micro-objects, all the processes and mutual transitions are various manifestations of matter. What, then, is matter? As mentioned above, pre-Marxian materialists related the concept of matter to that of the primary substance. Yet, holding as they did that the primary substance was, alternatively, air, water, fire, various combinations of atoms or corpuscules comprising substances, they equated the concept of matter to specific material manifestations. By reducing matter to specific isolated formations they oversimplified and diluted the picture of the world in its diversity. No matter how they broadened the framework of the concept of the primary substance subsequently by adding to it, alternatively, earth, wood and iron, they still failed to make the real world fit in the framework. At the same time, the philosophers could think of no new definition of matter. The best they could do in this respect was agree that matter is atoms forming substances. Although this approach to matter by science was held to be correct up to the late 1800s, it had to be replaced by another view as it was not precise enough. At the turn of the 20th century man's knowledge of the world became more profound. New material formations were discovered; besides "elementary particles", atomic nuclei and an endless variety of macro-objects in the unlimited Universe, they included physical fields (electromagnetic, nuclear and gravitational) which have structures and properties different from those of matter. In the early 1900s, new physical phenomena were discovered, including radioactivity, X-rays and others; new theories on the structure of matter emerged, and the concepts held by classical physics were no longer regarded as absolute truths. All this called for a new approach to the definition of the concept of matter. The definition was offered by V. I. Lenin. While the first materialists linked the interpretation of matter to specific material manifestations, the new definition of matter was based on an acceptance of infinite diversity and interrelationships within material being in general. Lenin proposed to use the concept of matter *in its widest sense,* as *everything existing objectively. "Matter is the objective reality given to us in sensation."*[1]

Objective reality is everything that has existed in the real world, that exists and of necessity will exist in the future; it is the entire Universe in its mutual transitions and transformations which exist independently of consciousness and of the ideal. As objective reality, matter has a number of universal properties: it cannot be destroyed or created; it is eternal and endless. It is *causa sui,* it carries all its properties and internal relationships and is the basis of unity of the Universe.

Matter cannot emerge out of nothing; neither can it disappear without a trace. It merely goes from one state to another and changes its forms. Seas, forests, mountains, man and society are merely certain states, or manifestations, of matter. A pencil, a book, a notebook or a bird cannot be called matter. They can only be described as specific *manifestations* of matter. Otherwise one would have to accept finiteness and exhaustibility of matter. Matter cannot be reduced to some final and inalterable elements comprizing material bodies. No matter how simple an object might seem, it always has a composite structure. This being so, matter cannot be described as something other than the objective world as a whole. The word "matter" is nothing but a concept used by men to denote the material Universe as a whole, or objective reality. It is for this reason that Lenin, describing a philosophical understanding of matter in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,* defined it as follows: "Matter is a philosophical category denoting the objective reality which is given to man by his sensations, and which is copied, photographed and reflected by our sensations, while existing independently of them"[1]. The definition is valuable in that, on the one hand, it provides a more profound understanding of the essence of individual manifestations of matter, and on the other, warns against an unjustifiably narrow approach to reality in its diversity.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", *Collected Works,* Vol. 14, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 146.

The definition is also valuable in that, besides providing a scientific answer to the very important question on what matter is, it also serves as a guiding rule, or method, for approaching all the other problems related to the concept of material nature of the world. Lenin's definition of matter plays an important methodological role. If matter is the objective world as a whole, then there is nothing in the objective world that is not matter. Those who have acquired, besides a grasp of, a profound understanding of Lenin's definition of matter will not be misled by idealist philosophers' assurances to the effect that new discoveries in physics can prove the existence of something not related to matter.

The importance of this definition of matter also consists in the fact that it provides a clear-cut answer to the basic question of philosophy. It follows from the definition that it is objective reality that influences the senses and not vice versa. Consequently, matter is primary and consciousness secondary. The definition also shows that the objective world is cognizable, since it contains a reference to the fact that the world is copied by our sensations and is photographed in our consciousness; therefore, it is cognizable. Further, the definition entails a clear distinction of philosophical problems of a field of knowledge from specific problems related to a study of individual material structures using methods accepted in natural sciences.

## 2. Movement as a Mode of Existence of Matter

Both everyday life and science convincingly demonstrate that nature knows no absolute immobility, rest and immutability. The world is in constant movement, it is incessantly changing.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Ibid.*, p. 130.

## Concept of Movement. Causes of Movement

What exactly is movement? What causes it and what is its source? Conventionally, movement is seen as a change of an object's position in space; it is held to be caused by outside influences on the object.

Yet, as seen from a scientific analysis of processes and phenomena, movement is more than a mere change of position; nor is it caused by an outside effort or impetus. Every material object and each particle thereof are movable and changeable not only when they shift one in relation to another, but also by their inherent internal nature. Thus, dialectical materialist philosophy understands movement as all the processes and changes occurring in nature, the processes of development of matter and its transition from one state to another with new characteristics and properties. Movement is change in general, it is a mode of existence of matter. Movement is as eternal as matter is; therefore, talking about the source of movement makes no sense. Still, as this question is advanced by idealism and religion, dialectical materialist philosophy provides an answer. Movement is caused by inherent contradictions in matter. This property is caused by the infinite diversity of the world, not only in its external manifestations but also in its internal structure, forms of relationships and causalities. Yet, what does the diversity of the world or, say, of structural elements of some system or other mean? It means that there is a *difference* between various elements. The difference of the system's elements, in turn, means that there is an interaction between them, since it is only in the process of interaction that diversities are revealed. Systems and structures with different elements are contradictory. The higher the degree of diversity of elements comprising systems or structures, the greater the contradictions. Where the difference between the elements makes them opposites and there is no coincidence, struggle between them begins. In the course of the struggle, the contradiction is solved and the process of transition of the system into a new state takes place.

*It is the contradictory nature of material systems and structures and the process of elimination of contradictions, as a result of which systems and structures* pass into a qualitatively new state, that are *the cause of movement.* As movement is inherent in matter itself, matter has the property of *self-movement.* Further, since material systems and structures are never devoid of contradictions, even their states of stability are simultaneously undergoing continuous change. Due to this, it is only temporarily, that systems and structures are in a state of stability and rest. Movement and change are absolute, while stability and rest are relative.

Idealist philosophers assume the existence of an absolute rest as a total absence of all movement or change. They need this to substantiate the existence of a non-material source of movement, a spiritual force representing an active beginning or an initial impetus which gives life to the world.

They also reject absolute changeability so as to reject the inevitability of progressive transformations in the course of social development and to substantiate the inviolability and eternal viability of regimes of exploitation. Yet, they can advance no arguments to substantiate these claims. Their allegations, moreover, are at variance with conclusions reached by science. There are no objects or phenomena in the world which would exist unchanged once and for all, seemingly set in time; there are only material objects constantly undergoing change and development. According to latest scientific achievements, no absolute rest exists that would rule out movement or change; there is only relative rest. An object on Earth, for one, is in a state of rest only vis-à-vis the Earth's surface. The same object participates in the rotation of the Earth on its axis and its revolution around the Sun, as well as in the movement of the entire solar system around the center of the Galaxy. Besides, molecules and atoms within the object are in movement and complex processes take place in it.

Similarly, there are no social relations established once and for all. The more important the differences in social positions of men and classes (as in a society of exploitation, for example), the greater the instability and contradictions in the society, the higher the probability of a revolutionary conflagration which would lead the system out of the contradictory state. A revolutionary upheaval in the feudal society in Afghanistan in April 1978 did not occur because someone wanted to disturb peace in the country; it took place because the differences in social positions of workers, on the one hand, and of feudals and rich merchants, on the other, reached their limits, leading to irreconcilable contradictions between them which required a solution by revolutionary means.

What follows from the above? The main conclusion is the following: if matter is inherently contradictory, it can only exist in movement. Movement is as eternal and inexhaustible as matter, since it is a mode of existence of matter.

Since all things in the world are in movement and change, any phenomenon, object or process should of necessity be approached taking into account its movement and changes.

This methodological conclusion is fully applicable to knowledge. The process of cognition does not mark time; it moves from incomplete to fuller knowledge; if we are to stay abreast of it, we must never cease to learn more, to bring our knowledge in accordance with the constantly changing reality. According to an Oriental saying, "He who does not acquire knowledge every day loses it daily". This is the logic of life and the logic of its cognition.

## Forms of Motion of Matter

The diversity of the forms of motion of matter corresponds to the diversity of its manifestations. The *mechanical* motion of objects in space and their motion relative to one another is the most primitive kind of the motion of matter. Thermal processes, chaotic movements of molecules, sound and electromagnetic processes, etc., are a more complicated type of motion. This form of motion of matter is called the *physical* form.

The motion of atoms in molecules, the *joining together* of atoms and molecules is called *chemical motion.*

*Biological motion* is yet another, even more complicated form of motion. The biological form (kind) of motion is taken to mean the life of organic (live) nature, physiological processes in plants and animals, the evolution of species, etc.

Man's social life–the development of material production, economic relations between men, cognitive processes, etc.–is a most complex form of motion. It is called the *social* form.

Each form of motion of matter is an expression of specific aspects and peculiarities of its material carrier. Mechanical motion, for instance, expresses the property of discreteness (non-continuity) of matter, and is the motion of micro- and macro-systems. Molecules are the carriers of physical movement, atoms of the chemical form of motion, etc.

At the same time, the known forms of motion of matter do not exist independently, or in isolation, from one another; they are interrelated. Thus, the chaotic movement of molecules generates heat processes. Heat processes can cause chemical transformations and light phenomena. At a certain stage of development, chemical processes lead to the formation of protein bodies, and on this basis, to the emergence of life, i.e., to the biological form of motion of matter.

It follows that some forms of motion of matter can turn into the other forms; in particular, this is reflected in the law of the conservation and transformation of energy and matter. Yet, as each stage in the development of matter corresponds to a form of motion, forms of motion differ qualitatively, and the highest forms of motion of matter cannot be reduced to the lowest. In physiological processes, for example, both mechanical motion, i.e. the motion in space of elements involved in the processes, and physical and chemical motion, i.e. the movement of molecules and atoms, are evident. Still, physiological processes are not reduced to, and are not exclusively brought about by, the mechanical, physical and chemical motion of these elements, molecules and atoms. It follows that social life, the highest form of motion of matter, cannot be explained, for example, through biological processes, the way idealists do. They claim, among other things, that the same laws are in effect in society and in animal life, i.e., the strongest survive. The rich and the poor are claimed to exist because some are stronger and others weaker. In actual fact, however, a strong man can be poor if he has no property and lives in a society based on exploitation and enslavement.

A profound understanding of forms of motion of matter, of their interrelationship and mutual transitions leads to an understanding of the basic classification of scientific knowledge. If one cognizes real processes, one's knowledge is a reflection of the processes. Thus, different sciences correspond to different forms of motion of matter, with the mechanical form studied by mechanics, the physical and chemical forms by physics and chemistry, the biological form by biology, and the social form by social sciences.

Other fields of knowledge which do not have a definite field or some object of the real world to study are not a consequence of the reflection of the world and are no sciences. One of these is idealistic philosophy which does not accept the dependence of spiritual processes on material ones and does not require a correspondence between our thoughts and reality.

## 3. Space and Time: Universal Forms of Existence of Matter

The motion of matter is only possible in time and space. All natural objects, including man, and all material processes of the objective world take up space.

Likewise, physical objects and man himself exist minute by minute, hour by hour and day by day. Every object and every natural phenomenon have a future, present and past, i.e. exist in time.

All this is a reflection of *spatial nature* and *duration,* among other properties of material objects and processes. *Space is the form of existence of matter which expresses the length, location and size of objects, processes and phenomena, as well as their structural composition. Time is the form of existence of matter which expresses the duration of processes and phenomena, their rythm and genetical interrelationship.*

Space and time are universal forms of existence of matter. There is no, nor can there be, matter outside space and time, and vice versa, there is no space and time without matter.

Like matter, space and time have neither beginning nor end. They are eternal and infinite. The above properties, as well as an objective nature, are common to space and time. At the same time, each has its own specific properties. *Space is three-dimensional and isotropic,* i.e. homogeneous at all points and in all directions. *Time is one-dimensional and has only one direction,* from the past to the future. Time is irreversible.

The existence of properties specific to space and time has led some philosophers, past and present, to admitting an isolated and independent existence of time and space both as regards each other and vis-à-vis matter. Ancient atomists Democritus, Epicurus and Lucretius Carus, to name a few, held that a vacuum existed for material atoms to move in. The same view was advocated by Isaac Newton in the late 1600s. They held that space was a void wherein matter moved in all directions. They also saw time as "pure" duration. True, this description of space and time is not in contradiction with classical mechanics and Euclidean geometry. Yet, a more profound analysis of space and time began with Aristotle to be developed in the course of the 17th through the 19th centuries by G. Leibniz, M. V. Lomonosov and mathematicians N. I. Lobachevsky and G. Riemann. According to their research, space and time did not exist in isolation and independently, both vis-à-vis each other and relative to matter. Subsequently science confirmed that it was this concept that was correct. In particular, the correctness of their hypotheses was demonstrated in the early 1900s by Albert Einstein's special and general theories of relativity. According to the theories, specific properties and quantitative characteristics (parameters) of space and time (distances, angles and time intervals) change with the transition from one system to another which is in motion vis-à-vis the first one. Thus, with material systems approaching the speed of light, the duration of time intervals between events increases, while distances between the locations (points) of events are reduced respectively.

Space and time are interrelated forms of existence of matter which are inseparably linked with it. The unity and interrelationship of matter, movement, space and time are thus regarded as a single material moving time-and-space continuum (diversity), existing in the three dimensions of space and in the fourth dimension, of time.

## 4. Material Unity and Diversity of the World

Thus, the world around us is eternal and infinite matter, while movement, space and time are its mode and form of existence.

The material nature of the world means that matter is a unique universal substance; the objective world is nothing but moving matter which exhausts all being. The uniqueness of matter also means the wholeness of the world and its material unity. The material unity of the world has diverse manifestations. Thus there is an endless multitude of material objects and systems in the world which are structurally different and yet have similar physical and chemical compositions; matter, motion, space and time are inseparably interrelated.

Further, the unity of the world is also reflected in the fact that living matter and human consciousness belong to the same Universe. Consciousness is a specific property of matter. Marx proved that although society is different from nature, it is also inseparably linked with it and has a material basis of existence. Thus, the unity of the world is based on a universal material foundation whereof all forms of manifestations of matter, including live and socially organized ones, are composed. Moreover, the basic elements existing on Earth and on other celestial bodies in the Universe were shown to be totally identical. The celestial bodies are composed of the same elements as the Earth. This can be seen, for instance, from the analysis of objects coming from deep outer space, like meteorites. Their basic component is iron, an element which is widespread on Earth. This is a convincing demonstration of the unity of the Universe. Apart from the single material basis, a single set of laws is effective in nature. The Universe functions as a single mechanism where all phenomena are invariably justified and there is no room for processes that would occur outside the framework of objective laws.

Already in the 1700s Newton proved that the laws of mechanics, which make the Earth revolve around the Sun, also make the Moon revolve around the Earth, and the other planets around the Sun. When space probes reached the Moon, Venus and Mars and landed in predetermined areas, we saw another demonstration that man-made objects are also governed by the same laws, as their launch from the Earth and flight along predetermined trajectories were made possible by calculations performed taking into account these universal laws.

On the basis of all of the above, dialectical materialist philosophy arrived at its basic conclusion and was able to generalize comprehensively the provisions concerning the unity and wholeness of the world. All objective laws and phenomena, and all systems are based on matter and its properties; if everything we come across in the world is nothing but matter in the process of development, then nothing that is not matter in motion has existed or will exist anywhere or at any time. The immaterial world, "the beyond" has never existed. Nor will it ever exist.

The idea that the world is a single whole is characteristic of idealistic doctrines too. Yet, idealist philosophers see consciousness, or spirit, and not matter, as the sole substance (basis) of the Universe. Science has demonstrated, as we shall see in the next chapter, that consciousness (spirit) is born of matter, being one of its properties. Thus, consciousness or spirit cannot be an isolated phenomenon independent of matter.

Besides monistic philosophical doctriens, dualistic and pluralistic doctrines are also known; they are just as inconsistent as the idealists' monistic ones. Attempts at predicating the unity of the world on thinking, rather than objective reality (matter) are illconceived as well. According to Lenin, these attempts only lead to confusion. A case in point is that of German philosopher Eugen Dühring who stated that the world was one because we think of it as one. Yet, one can think of anything one pleases, which does not make the non-existent either material or real. Therefore, the unity of the world should be construed from objective reality rather than from thinking. According to Frederick Engels, the unity of the world is in its material nature. In other words, the world is one because it is material. This has to be borne in mind as an important methodological basis for improving social practice. An idealistic world outlook based on the principle of primacy of spirit, on the existence of "the beyond", of "life after death" marks man's entire thinking and feelings, goals, attitudes to life and to the world with servility. It suppresses his social activities and leads to indifference to ideals in life. On the contrary, a demonstration that the world is material and one leads to a materialist world outlook, gives man the knowledge of the laws of the world; it is a source of an active attitude to the world, a source of inspired faith in social progress.

### *Test Questions*

1. What is matter? Describe the essence of the philosophical definition of matter and its methodological importance for natural sciences.
2. What is motion? Where is its source? What is meant by the "self-motion" of matter?
3. Name the basic forms of motion of matter. Describe the methodological importance of the dialectical materialist conclusion that superior forms of motion are not reducible to simple ones.
4. What is space and what is time? Elaborate on the provision concerning the inseparability of matter, movement, space and time.

## *Chapter IV*

# DIALECTICAL MATERIALIST PHILOSOPHY ON THE ORIGINS OF LIFE, MAN AND CONSCIOUSNESS

## Background

The question of the origin of life on Earth, man and man's consciousness is even more urgent and controversial than that of the essence of the Universe.

Its emergence, discussion and the ideological struggle involved are due to the need for the settlement of the question concerning the origin and essence of consciousness.

If the question of what was primary and what was secondary was to be answered, one had to demonstrate what exactly was held to be matter and what was understood by consciousness. The problem of consciousness turned out to be the most difficult.

What, then, is consciousness? How did it originate?

For centuries, this problem preoccupies the best human minds. The primary concern was, why does man cease to think, move and talk after death. "Because the soul leaves the body," our ancestors answered. Then what is the soul? How does it relate to the body? It seemed impossible to find the answer. How can one find it if one deals with something that cannot be seen or heard and has neither smell nor color? Are we not unaware of thoughts and suffering of others unless we are told about them? Thus, the concept of the soul was linked to all that could not be verified or explained, and seemed an enigma. Not surprisingly, a great many fantastic ideas were advanced along with rational thoughts pertaining to the problem of the soul. There were many who saw it as an immaterial, incorporeal, eternal and supernatural force existing independently and in isolation from the body. A predominant role was ascribed to the soul not only as regards the human body but also vis-à-vis the world as a whole. This included, besides the real world, also "the beyond" and "life after death". "The soul enters man temporarily at birth and leaves the body after death," our ancestors believed. Even today the idea of life after death has some supporters. There were never any "witnesses" who would have come back from "the beyond". The idea was stressed nine centuries ago by the great Persian and Tajik scientist, philosopher and poet, Omar Khayyam:

> Strange, is it not? that of the myriads who
> Before us pass'd the door of Darkness through
> Not one returns to tell us of the Road,
> Which to discover we must travel too.

Now we have what might be called witnesses; more about it below. In the past, however, even the most prominent idealist philosophers were unable to offer at least a partly plausible interpretation of the problem. Plato, for one, equated the soul to the eternal idea. To Hegel, the soul was a sensual manifestation of the spirit in its relationship with matter. Dualists (Descartes and others) saw the spirit as something primary, existing side by side with the body.

Unlike the idealists, materialists have always been opposed to such an approach to the soul. Still, for them, too, the problem was extremely difficult. At first they advanced a doctrine on a material soul composed of miniscule material formations, while reducing its activities, including thinking, to elementary mechanical, physical or chemical processes. Later, when materialists, including Giordano Bruno (1548-1600), Jean B. Robinet (1735-1820) and Denis Diderot (1713-1784), had to face the problem of origins of consciousness, they came to regard it as an eternal, inherent property of matter, i.e. they admitted that the world was universally animate. This philosophy was called hylosoism (from Greek *hylo,* matter, and *zoï,* life). Subsequently, some of the most prominent materialists found themselves in the impasse of pantheism (from Greek *pan,* all, and *theos,* god) as they identified Universal Reason with god and nature (e.g. Baruch Spinoza).

An original solution of the problem of consciousness and thinking was attempted by vulgar materialists (from Latin *vulgaris,* common). German natural scientist and philosopher L. Büchner, German physiologist and philosopher J. Moleschott, and others assumed that consciousness and thinking were simple products of physiology. They claimed that thought was produced by the brain in much the same manner as liver produced bile. This approach to consciousness was a gross oversimplification of the problem.

Only dialectical materialist philosophy was to provide the most complete answer to the problem.

From the viewpoint of dialectical materialist philosophy, if the problem of the origin of consciousness and of its essence is to be solved, a number of preliminary questions have to be answered first:

1. Since consciousness is only inherent in living matter, one has to know the origins of living matter and of life on Earth.

2. As consciousness is inherent, among all forms of living matter, only in its highly organized form, the brain, one must know how liv-

ing organisms evolved and how they came about to have a brain.

3. Since it is only and specifically the human brain, as opposed to other brains that has consciousness, the question of the origin of man with his ability to think has to be answered.

4. Finally, since it is not the brain itself (even the human brain) but the world it reflects and man's interaction with the world that is the source of consciousness, one must deal with the question of the interaction of man with the environment as he cognizes it, as his brain functions, ideas are formed and thinking in general takes place.

## 1. The Origins of Life on Earth and Its Development

### Prerequisites for the Emergence of Life

There are legends and idealistic doctrines on the origins of life on Earth according to which life was brought about by a creator and is a manifestation of some vital force; living organisms are said to be static, always remaining as brought to life by the creator. On the basis of scientific achievements materialist scientists assume that life was self-generating, that it emerged of non-living matter as a result of its development without any outside interference by a supernatural force. What is life, then? "*Life is the mode of existence of albuminous bodies*, and this mode of existence essentially consists in the constant self-renewal of the chemical constituents of these bodies."[1] According to the definition, life processes and life itself exist in a close relationship with non-living nature and its chemical compounds, and that living matter is different from non-living matter only in that it is capable of maintaining self-renewal of the chemical compounds, and consequently, of development.

A basic distinguishing feature of all life is its ability to adapt itself to the environment, to actively regulate its composition and functions in accordance with various forms of movement. Adaptation, regulation and movement are the basic properties of all things living which underlie the development of fauna and flora.

The formation of chemical compounds capable of self-renewal and adaptation to the environment are the basic prerequisites of the emergence and development of life on Earth. How were the chemical compounds formed? How did living organisms originate from them, with an ability to change under the influence of the environment?

According to the latest scientific achievements, some of the elements required for the formation of chemical compounds and their transformation into proteins, the basis of life, were already contained in the original dust cloud out of which the solar system was formed. The composition and combinations of the elements depend on specific conditions under which they are found.

---

[1] Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 100.

In the atmosphere of hot stars, for example, where temperatures rise to 15-28 thousand degrees Centigrade, all the elements exist as isolated atoms. At lower temperatures of 15 to 12 thousand degrees, the simplest combinations of carbon and hydrogen are formed, like methane, di-carbon, etc. In this temperature, carbon manifests its remarkable ability to combine its atoms in chains by pairs. In lower temperatures, carbon combines with iron, nickel and cobalt forming carbides. The reaction of carbides with water results in hydrocarbons.

These were the conditions prevailing at the time when the Earth was formed.

## The Origin of Earth

The process of formation of the planet Earth began about 5 billion years ago from a gas and dust cloud. The cloud was composed of 84.4 per cent of water, 14.3 per cent of carbon dioxide, 1.1 per cent of methane, and 0.2 per cent of nitrogen, with traces of ammonia and argon and was held near the Sun by the forces of gravity. It revolved around the Sun while increasing its density and thickness to acquire the shape of a disc. The part of the gas and dust cloud which was closest to the Sun was accumulating considerable heat. This caused the gas from the area to evaporate, while non-volatile substances–silicates, metals, oxides, sulphides and carbides–formed planets Mercury, Venus, Earth and Mars. In more remote areas, other planets were formed, which also comprised some other elements.

Initially cold, Earth gradually became warmer due to the decay of radioactive elements contained in it. In its center, the temperature rose to 1000 degrees Centigrade and higher. Under such temperatures, rock melted and was distributed according to density, with the heaviest elements going down, the lighter staying in the middle and the very lightest rising to the surface. At this stage of development, substances on Earth entered chemical reactions whose speed increased as the temperature went up. There was a substantial amount of gases in reaction products. Under enormous pressure, they erupted on the Earth's surface to form its primary atmosphere. Scientists evaluate the composition of the atmosphere of the time on the basis of the composition of gases erupting from currently active volcanoes. After approximately 150 million years, water particles from this "protoatmosphere" formed a dense cloud layer around the Earth. As the intensiveness of radioactive, diochemical and chemical processes decreased, the planet began to cool off. As temperatures went down to 100 degrees Centigrade and below, the steam, contained in the cloud layer of the atmosphere, accumulated and turned into shower rains. It rained day after day, day and night for millennia. Hollows in the Earth's surface which, like mountains, were formed by powerful volcanic eruptions, were being filled with water. The first seas and oceans appeared.

## Life Emerges

Ammonia, carbon dioxide, methane and other compounds were diluted by hot rain water. The amount of carbon dioxide decreased as it was diluted in water, while the hydrocarbon content intensified. Hydrocarbons now in the ocean interacted with the oxygen in water forming alcohols, aldehydes, ketones and organic acids. In turn, these interacted with ammonia to form more elaborate organic nitrogen-containing compounds, like aminoacids. Under high pressure, aminoacids combined into simple and then into compound protein molecules. Combinations of two protein molecules, salts and water became so-called coocervates. Coocervate drops attracted organic and inorganic substances in solution, became larger and divided in two.

The coocervate drops also discharged substances into the environment. The interaction of the coocervate drops with the environment gave rise to a primitive form of metabolism. The consolidation of this property in coocervate drops contributed to a more profound interaction with the environment and to their self-renewal. Protein bodies also consolidated structurally. Finally, after several million, or more precisely, about 4 billion years, came the first protozoa. These were monocellular life forms. They are still preserved, if in a more complicated form (viruses, bacteria, bluegreen algae, etc.).

Further evolution of the protozoa resulted in multicellular life forms. With photosynthesis, the mainstream of life was divided in two, animals and plants, due to a divergence (separation) of organisms according to types of nutrition and metabolism.

The ancient flagellates fed both like animals and like plants. Indicative of them is the modern green euglena which feeds like a plant when exposed to light and like an animal when in darkness.

The organisms that fed by turning carbon dioxide and water into organic substances in the sunlight became the original rudimentary plants. Those that subsisted on oxygen and organic substances contained in sea water initiated the development of water animals.

The first multicellular animals were similar to fresh-water and sea sponges and coelenterates, who evolved into modern hydras, medusae and corals.

A most important stage in the advance of living organisms was the appearance of those with a double body simmetry, which differentiated the body into the front and the rear, and back and abdominal parts. In the front end, sense-organs and nerve-knots developed, followed by the brain. The spinal side performed a protective function, which entailed the development there of various skin glands, mechanical formations (spikes and hairs) and protective coloration. The abdominal side was responsible for locomotion and capture of food. The animals' behavior changed; they became increasingly agile, and dexterous, and had more vital energy in general. Yet all the species (both animal and plant) only inhabited seas and oceans, although some bacteria and monocellular algae could also exist in moist areas outside the seas and took part in soil formation processes.

## Evidence to Support the Natural Origin of Life from Non-Living Matter

As mentioned above, the point of departure in the transformation of non-living matter into living matter was the combination of carbon with iron, nickel and cobalt resulting in carbides. A combination of carbides and water turns them into hydrocarbons, and experiments support this. D. I. Mendeleyev, for instance, by subjecting iron carbide to steam under high temperature, obtained oil, and organic substance. Russian scientist K. L. Timiryazev (1843-1920) discovered natural photosynthesis, the process of transformation of non-organic substances into organic ones. He demonstrated that organic substances originate in the transformation by plants of the Sun's ray energy into the energy of chemical relations in organic substances. As a result of photosynthesis, over 100 billion tons of organic substances are produced, about 200 billion tons of carbon dioxide assimilated and about 145 billion tons of free oxygen discharged annually on Earth. The first green organisms' activity of synthesis brought oxygen to the Earth's primary atmosphere, created the ozone envelope and created the requisites for biological evolution. According to current science, it is now possible to recreate the physical and chemical environment assumed to have existed on the primeval Earth and to observe the processes of transformation of non-living matter into live one without any interference. For example, if simple gas mixtures, composed of methane, ammonia, hydrogen and steam, or primitive carbonaceous compounds are subjected to electric changes or ultraviolet rays, complex organic compounds are formed, including aminoacids, nucleotides and even peptide or nucleotide chains. Although a great number of organic by-products of less importance for life, like aminoacids and nucleotides, are also formed, scientists regard this as an incontestable demonstration of natural, or self-induced origin of life on this planet.

This is also confirmed by studies of various layers of the Earth. According to historical geology, older geological stratifications contain remnants of once-existent living organisms which were more primitive than present-day living organisms. The deeper the stratum, the more primitive the organisms. Finally, strata have been found with no remnants at all. Consequently, it was only at a certain stage of the Earth's history that life originated to be continuously developed and perfected subsequently.

The volume of data accumulated is sufficiently important to predict that in a near future science will be at a level where it will be capable of synthesizing protein and recreating all the processes of conversion of non-organic matter into organic matter.

Natural science has thus demonstrated the correctness of dialectical materialism's provision that live nature originated in a natural manner as a result of development of matter. By the same token, the idealists' dogmas on the supernatural creation of all things living are refuted. In the course of its infinitely long existence, living matter originated and ceased to exist many times and in many worlds, like the worlds themselves. A case in point are astronomical data. Using the latest equipment, scientists acquire data concerning the emergence of life on some planets and its possible disappearance on others. According to US astronomer Harlow Shapley (1885-1972), the observable Universe alone contains from $10^8$ to $10^{14}$ planets where various forms of life are possible, and as many where life has disappeared forever. It is clearly no accident that traces of extraterrestrial life are found in meteorites. It can then be inferred that not only does life originate naturally in non-living nature, but that it is strictly governed by this nature's laws. According to scientists' calculations, the most propitious environment for the emergence of life exists at a distance of 142 to 152 million kilometers from a star like the Sun. This planet is about 150 million kilometers from the Sun, which could have been a requisite for the emergence and preservation of life on Earth.

This is yet another confirmation of one of the basic conclusions made by dialectical materialist philosophy concerning universal interrelationship and mutual causality, eternal circuit, transformation of various forms of movement and manifestations of matter into one another, dependence of living matter on non-living matter, natural and law-governed emergence and development of life. Still, the fact that life emerged and developed on Earth in accordance with certain laws does not mean that the process was somehow predetermined. On the contrary, science shows that accident played a major role in the emergence of individual evolutionary processes. Yet this accident itself was a consequence of other universal laws and was thus objective in nature. The regularity of emergence and development of life only means that under certain predetermined conditions non-living matter can be transformed into living matter, and under others life, having originated, can develop into higher organisms.

This explains why all simple organisms under all conditions did not evolve into higher ones. Had the evolution of living nature consisted in a mere transformation of all simple organisms into higher ones, only the higher forms would exist presently. The question of progress would be easy to solve.

In actual fact, the structure of the evolutionary process was far more complicated. While all aspects of the problem are not yet known, the essence of the problem of origins and development of life is now quite clear.

## Land Organisms Develop as First Land Plants Appear

Due to volcanic processes, large land areas were no longer covered with water causing many forms of algae to become extinct. Still, some algae adjusted to a new habitat—dry, although often flooded, land.

Research data indicate that these were psylophites.

The accumulation of organic products in the soil caused the psylophites to evolve into higher forms, club-mosses, horse-tails and ferns. Yet it was only about 350 million years ago that an evolutionary breakthrough took place in the development of land flora, in the early Carboniferous Age with its warm and humid climate and an abundance of atmospheric carbon dioxide, accumulated as a result of intensive volcanic activity. This period saw the spread of vast forests of Filicineae, including giant ferns and arborescent horse-tails and club-mosses fifteen to thirty meters tall. As they made the soil fertile, land plants proper appeared. Land flora enriched the Earth with oxygen, and the conditions became propitious for the development of land animals.

On vacant areas, plants of the genus Angiospermae became widespread. They acquired flowers, a broad and universal instrument for pollination and plant reproduction.

The pervasive development of the Angiospermae was accompanied by a simultaneous development of higher insects pollinating them, of butterflies, bumble-bees, bees, flies, etc.

## First Animals Appear on Land

The emergence and development of land plants created the basic prerequisites for the evolution of first land animals and their development in a new environment, including a new composition of the atmosphere and a supply of food.

Fishes in seas and oceans had undergone important changes; the maxillotestaceous fish appeared.

The evolution of maxillae (jaws) was a major stage in the development of general organization of the vertebrates. The animals with ossified maxillae were able to find their prey more actively and to subdue it more effectively; as a result, in the process of natural selection their nervous system, sense organs, instincts and behavior were improving.

The Crossopterygii were the most widespread of these. They had two systems of breathing, the gill and the supplementary lung breathing, for which they used one or two air bladders, ventral diverticula of the oesophagus. They were the ones that became the first land animals. They used their fins both for swimming and for crawling.

Amphibias were the most primitive land vertebrates. It has been established that they evolved from a group of the Crossopterygii. They inhabited shallow water reservoirs which used to dry up from time to time, forcing the animals to crawl over to the remaining pools. This gradually, on the basis of hereditary variability, turned the fins into limbs which could be used to move on land.

The Crossopterygii established themselves on land due to the transformation of fins into limbs and due to lung breathing.

The Stegocephalia were the most ancient Amphibia. Their length ranged from several centimeters to four meters. In their skeleton structure, besides the features of the Amphibia (limb structure and the exterior), features of fishes are also noticeable, including biconcave vertebrae and the presence of a notochord, like in the modern sturgeons. At the same time, the later Stegocephalia acquired a rudimentary jugular-cervical section of the spine, a reptiles' feature. As they adjusted to various habitats, the Stegocephalia evolved into other amphibious species.

As the living conditions on Earth changed, so did the amphibia. Only the Amphibia which developed qualities most useful under the new conditions were able to establish themselves on land further. The animals changed their mode of reproduction, acquiring internal fertilization; their embryos developed in eggs on land. This important feature made the animals no longer dependent on water for reproduction and development. Grown-up animals developed horny scales which kept them moist; their lungs and vascular system improved also. A new class of vertebrates appeared, the reptiles. Primitive reptiles developed into higher ones, with a major role in the development of animals being played by the anomodontia. This order of reptiles evolved into the first mammals. It was during the Jurassic period (about 200 million years ago) that the reptile species became most diversified. At the time, giant carnivorous and herbivorous reptilia were predominant, as well as dinosaurs with the body mass of 17 to 20 tons and ichthyosaurs, carnivorous and viviparous water reptiles. Up in the sky there were flying reptiles, some no bigger than a sparrow and others with the span of wings (transformed front limbs) of 7 to 8 meters.

Still, as the animals required abundant food, mostly of plant origin, which was lacking due to unfavorable conditions, they soon became extinct, having existed a mere several million years. Of the ancient reptiles only the mammals survived. Due to natural selection, they acquired and developed such features as live birth, suckling the young with .mother's milk, permanent body temperature and differentiation of teeth, all important for further progress.

The original mammals were small and primitive and looked like modern marsupial rats, shrews and hedgehogs. They descended from the anomodont reptiles. A four-chamber heart and a permanent body temperature (as opposed to the variable temperature of other animals) contributed to their higher rate of metabolism and the conversion of their energy into vital processes. The embryos of the mammals developed in the mother's body and following birth were nourished by her milk; this helped more embryos survive than with the other animals. Besides their survival, this also ensured the increase of their numbers.

## The Original Birds

As already noted, among the reptiles there were some that had wings and could fly. They descended from scaly reptiles which moved about on hind legs. This group evolved into tree-climbing reptiles whose scales was changing into feathers so as to make jumping from tree to tree easier. The development of a feather cover and of features for flying was a major change which resulted in the advent of birds. The birds gradually supplanted flying reptiles as they had important advantages which they acquired naturally as a result of hereditary changes. The motion of the wings was brought about by strong muscles; a four-chamber heart maintained an increased rate of metabolism; their care for the offspring guaranteed its survival. Both the birds and the mammals became less dependent on the temperature of their environment than the other animals. Thanks angiospermous plants, animals, and in particular birds and mammals, already had a supply of food.

## Mountains are Formed and the Earth's Climate Changes

As the process of evolution approached the stage which began approximately 60 to 70 million years ago, rapid geological and climatic transformations began on this planet. Warm seas were replaced by mountain ranges which were rising in the Caucasus, the Crimea, the Alps, the Pyrenees and the Himalayas. Glaciers began their descent from the Scandinavian mountains. High mountain ranges disrupted the circulation of air masses; as a result, some regions became colder while in others hot dry areas appeared.

As the cold set in and rivers began to freeze in winter, deciduous plants—the maple, the linden, the alder, the poplar, the oak among others found themselves in a favorable position. Evergreen forests were replaced by deciduous ones.

The vast expanses of what is now Siberia, Mongolia and North America were covered with grasslands which had replaced forests. In hot and dry areas there were no plants left; they were turning into deserts. During this period, birds and mammals occupied the predominant place in the animal world. Their permanent body temperature enabled them to survive under various conditions and to advance to both the hotter and the colder regions. In their successful development, the two groups also gained from the fact that in the main they lived in different habitats, the mammals on land, the birds in the air and both in water.

As they adjusted to the developing habitats, their central nervous system, and in particular the brain, progressively acquired increasingly complicated structures and broader functions. The greater sophistication of the brain was related to the development of higher nervous activity and to the increasingly complex behavior of animals as they adapted to specific conditions.

Their rapid development is attributable both to the great plasticity of their ancestors and to the vast diversity of conditions prevailing 30 to 35 million years ago. Groups of mammals came to evolve into present-day rodents, insectivorous animals, cheiroptera, cetaceans, ungulates, predator simians and others. It was at that time that the Parapithecus, an ape-like animal, also appeared. It was the size of a cat, lived in trees and fed on insects and plants. Its jaws and teeth were the same as those of anthropoid apes. The parapitecus evolved into the modern gibbon and orangutang and into another branch, the now extinct Dryopithecus. The evolution of the Dryopithecus gave three branches of offspring; two of these finally led to the chimpanzee, gorilla and man.

About three million years ago the animal world acquired the present day appearance; somewhat later, man arrived to take the dominant place in nature.

## Forces Behind the Development of Life

The organic world is a striking one, not only as far as the complexity of its structure is concerned but also as regards the diversity of the species. There are about 1.5 million species of animals and up to 500 thousand species of plants on earth.

At the same time, as already shown, all the living creatures originate practically from one cell; it is only thereafter that they are transformed into complicated organisms as they interact with the environment. What are the forces behind this process and its factors? How can the complex diversity of the species be explained taking into account the unity of the organic world?

A detailed answer to these questions is offered by the theory of evolution advanced by British scientist Charles Darwin (1809-1882). On the basis of works by Swedish scientists Carolus Linnaeus (Carl von Linné, 1707-1778) and French scientist Jean Baptiste Pierre Lamarck (1744-1829) as well as many years of studies, Charles Darwin originated a materialist approach to living nature, found a brilliant solution to the problem of what causes the organic world to develop from primitive forms to higher ones and from the inferior to the superior forms, and pinpointed the sources of the diversity of species and of organic expediency.

It was Linnaeus who challenged the metaphysical notions concerning immutability of nature in its entirety; having systematized the existing groups of plants and animals and having divided them by species, he came to the conclusion that some species can evolve from others by cross-breeding and due to the influence of environmental changes. Lamarck, in *Philosophie Zoologique* (1809), rejected the metaphysical ideas concerning the constancy and immutability of species and also stated that the species change, albeit slowly and therefore unnoticeably. Having systematized various plant, insect and animal species, he demonstrated that the existence of species in nature is temporary rather than permanent; their constancy is therefore relative, which makes them changeable. By grading organisms according to the complexity of their structure, he was the first to show that the organic world develops from the most primitive life forms to superior ones in accordance with natural laws and explained the importance of relationship and of the bonds of kinship in the development of the organic world. Yet Lamarck failed to understand or to guess the laws of the movement of living nature from the simple to the complicated, from the lowest forms to the highest. He held that the process of evolution was caused by an inherent tendency of organisms to advance. This, however, is not exactly the case, as demonstrated by Darwin.

According to Darwin, the development of the organic world is linked to at least three interrelated factors, variability, heredity and selection.

## Variability, Heredity and Selection

*Variability* provides the material for the process of evolution, the material being individual hereditary variations of organisms. Thus variability is taken to mean the process of differentiation within one species. The offspring of one pair of animals or of plants, which came of a single fruit are never totally identical. For instance, lambs of one sheep differ as to their size, length of legs and head, coloration, length and density of wool locks, voice, habits, etc. Tree leaves look the same, yet at a closer examination not one looks like another.

Variability can be both (*mass*) group and *individual.* With mass variability, all animals of a breed or variety change in the same manner and in the same direction under the influence of definite factors. For instance, breeds of horses and cows living in the mountains become undersized with the course of time due to an insufficient nutritious value of food there. Northern breeds of sheep, if brought to hot countries, lose their thick wool within several generations. Individual variability causes minor variations within the same variety, breed or species. For instance, both red and yellow berries appear on one gooseberry branch, etc. All the variations become the basis for the emergence of new species in subsequent generations, which is contributed to by heredity.

*Heredity* is the common property of all organisms to preserve and transmit varieties of structure and development from ancestors to posterity. It makes the oak grow of an acorn, and chickens hatch from a hen's eggs. Heredity is also present in vegetative propagation. Propagation by layerings, grafts and tubers, whereby special and variety traits are transmitted to the offspring, is widely known. Heredity plays a role in the transmission to posterity of all that is of essence and has been acquired by an organism in the course of its life.

*Selection* also plays an important role in the development of the organic world. In nature, selection exists in the form of *struggle for existence,* which takes place because the number of organisms of each species born is many times that of those that will be able to survive in a given area. Some fishes, for example, spawn several million eggs annually. One poppy can yield up to 32 thousand seeds. A lychnis, according to Darwin's estimate, yields no less than 186,300 seeds. If the posterity of one species had been able to survive and to reproduce, before long it would have supplanted the other species on Earth. As a result, a contest, a struggle for existence takes place among the organisms. As a result, some of them gain in size and prosper while their neighbors are weakened. The stronger survive, and the weaker perish.

The struggle for existence also finds its reflection in *mutual assistance,* which underlies the existence of "social" forms of insects, e.g. wasps, bees, ants and termites. Taken individually, the insects would not have been able to maintain the conditions required for their survival and would have ceased to exist. The struggle for existence has also led animals to develop an ability to protect their offspring: if a herd of wild horses is in danger, foals are gathered in the center of the herd and are protected by mares facing them, while stallions protect the entire circle.

All the forms of struggle for existence, which are closely related to variability and heredity, represent the essence of the mechanism of *natural selection.* In the process of natural selection, useful individual varieties or variations are preserved, while the unfavorable ones are destroyed. From one generation to another, the varieties, which have useful, albeit insignificant, variations, under specific natural conditions are preserved and leave abundant and fertile offspring. Conversely, those with variations unfavorable for the same environment, leave increasingly fewer and weaker offspring, finally resulting in the extinction of the species. Incidentally, natural selection is not a matter of a "conscious choice by animals" or "some active force or deity". The role of the determining factor is played by the environment. Darwin only used the phrase "natural selection" for the purposes of brevity so as to designate the effect of natural laws.

In the process of natural selection, animals also acquired the property of *adaptability* to the environment. For example, various protective colorations are common in the animal world and include the apatetic, warning and concealing colorations. An apatetic coloration makes an organism less conspicuous against its background.

Amidst the greenery, bugs, flies, grasshoppers and other insects are colored green. In the North, where the habitat is almost continuously covered with snow, animals acquire a white coloration (polar bears and hares, willow-ptarmigans). In the desert, yellowish coloration is predominant (snakes, lizards, antelopes, lions). A warning or threatening coloration (bees and bumble-bees) also helps avoid danger, as well as other means of protection–hairs, spikes, stings, acrid or pungent secretions. A similarity of shape or coloration to some object, like a branch, twig, stone, etc., also provides concealment. Again, these properties were not acquired due to some predetermined "propitiousness"; they were caused by the fact that animals with this coloration, which they acquired due to variability and heredity, had a greater chance of survival, left more numerous posterity, and became predominant. The ancestors of green caterpillars could well have been other than green and not have fed on leaves. Still, let us suppose that due to some circumstances they were forced to start feeding on leaves. Quite understandably, a multitude of these insects which were conspicuous against the green background were pecked away by birds. Still, of the posterity of those left alive there may have been some who, due to variability, had shades of green. Clearly, insects of this color were less conspicuous on leaves and had a greater chance of survival than other varieties. In subsequent generations the insects which inherited the green coloration to a greater extent naturally became predominant. The process continued until almost all the insects devoid of the green coloration or insufficiently green were destroyed. Only the green caterpillars survived until today.

In this case, too, we see an incontestable demonstration that *natural selection is the motive force of the development of the organic world.*

Natural selection also underlies the divergence of features of animals who used to have the same *genus origins*, and the *diversity* of the organic world. The more the offspring of a species differ one from another, the easier it is for them to inhabit increasingly numerous and diverse regions, and the more diversified they become.

As varieties develop, species appear the diversity of which we witness in nature. This underlies the existence of various species of bears, hares, foxes, squirrels, etc., who all go back to one original species.

Other factors, for instance, isolation of natural habitats with the ensuing emergence of species of animals typical of the given region only, did of course have a major role to play. Still, the determining role in the process was played by natural selection. The process of species formation still continues. We currently see some signs to the effect that individual subspecies are becoming extinct, while their extreme varieties, having lost the ability to cross-breed, diverge and become independent species.

On the basis of the above, the conclusion can be made that natural selection has three closely related basic consequences: 1) a gradual increase in the complexity and organisation of living beings; 2) adaptability of organisms to the environment; 3) the diversity of species.

To summarize, the motive forces of development are essentially as follows:

1. Variability is characteristic of any group of animals or plants. Variability is one of the properties inherent in living organisms. Variations can be both hereditary and non-hereditary. Only hereditary variations are important for the development of the organic world.
2. The number of organisms of each species born is higher than that which will be able to find enough food, to survive and to leave posterity; the number of organisms of each species in a natural environment is nevertheless stable. One should therefore assume that the majority of each generation's offspring perishes.
3. As more organisms are born than are able to survive, they are in competition for food and habitats. This can be an active life-or-death struggle or a less conspicuous, albeit no less effective competition, as, for example, when animals have to face drought, cold or any other unfavourable conditions.
4. Hereditary changes which facilitate an organism's survival in a given environment, put those who possess them in a more advantageous position compared to the other, less adapted, organisms. The *ability of the fittest to survive* is the essential element of natural selection.

5. The surviving organisms give birth to the next generation; in this manner, all the "favorable" variations are transferred to the posterity. All this makes each successive generation more better adapted to its environment. As a result of historically extended natural selection, distant offspring can become so unlike their ancestors, that they could be defined as an independent species. It can also happen that certain members of a variety will acquire some variations and adapt themselves to environmental changes in one manner, while the other members, with a different set of variations, will adapt themselves differently. Thus several species can descend from one ancestral species.

## Reflection as a Property of Matter and a Factor in the Development of Living Organisms

Darwin's theory revealed a complicated mechanism of the organic world and of adaptability of animals and plants to their environment. Still, the question concerning the basic properties of matter which enable living organisms, under the influence of individual factors, to adapt to the changing environment, remained open. The emergence and development of dialectical materialist philosophy established the relationship of development of life on Earth with *reflection*, a property of matter. What is reflection?

*Reflection* is a property of matter; it is a special form of reaction by material objects and their associations to an external action. In the process, their structure or state, or both, are changed.

In non-living nature, reflection is a property of things to change if acted upon by other things, with the structure of changes being in accordance with some aspect of the thing acting on them, like a trace left by the action of one object on another. It takes place in at least three forms, that of chemical reflection (the process of an object's reflection on photographic film), a physical one (an imprint of a man's foot on clayey soil, snow, etc.), and that of mechanical reflection (the processes of reflection of pressure and of resilience measured by manometers, dynamometers, etc.).

In organic nature, the process of reflection is more complicated. With all live matter, the basic form of reflection is *irritability.* In plants, it takes place in *tropisms* (a sunflower always faces the sun and follows it; geranium leaves follow the source of light, etc.), *nasties* (an example is plant reaction to temperature variations) and *taxes* (reactions by some monocellular organisms, like bacterial and algae, aimed at capturing others).

With animals, manifestations of irritability differ from those in plants, and depend on the type of metabolism. As animals evolve, the forms and stages of irritability also change.

While in monocellular organisms irritability is reflected in the reaction of an entire cell, with the multicellulars the process always involves the action of a whole chain of *specialized nerve cells*; the external element (receptors) receives stimuli while the muscle element responds to external stimuli by movements.

With the structure of living organisms becoming more advanced, neurons, or intermediary nerve cells, appear. By their long extensions they transmit impulses from the receptor to the muscle cells of the reacting organ. In animals with a more advanced body structure, the reception of stimuli, transmission of impulses and reaction to them are thus performed by *individual organs*, viz., *receptors, neurons* and *muscles.*

In response to stimuli, animals use their muscles to perform a variety of complicated movements, such as walking, crawling, flying, feeding, taking care of the offspring, etc.

Movements aimed at the establishment of an optimum relationship of an organism with the environment are *adaptive movements.* Thus, irritability is living organisms' ability to react to all kinds of external stimuli in an expedient and selective manner. It is the most important means of improving the functioning of all living organisms and of their development. In the final analysis, the process leads to a greater sophistication of living organisms and to the emergence of higher animals.

Still, important as the role of irritability in the organisms' activity of adaptation may be, it does not meet all requirements of animals. It only maintains the vital activity of primitive living organisms. The primitive organisms' living body is not engaged in a search of the environment they need; all it does is react actively to the factors of the environment directly influencing it. As their *nervous system* developed, higher animals experienced the need for a new form of reflecting reality, that of *mental reflection.* As opposed to irritation, mental reflection is more than a mere reaction to a stimulus which causes individual movements; it is a reaction which causes the organism to have sensations (e.g., a sensations of light, of shape, sound, warmth and cold).

*Sensation* is the first, basic form of mental reflection; it is an act of transformation of the energy of an external stimulus into an actual subjective image, into a subjective state of the organism and its responses.

To animals, external irritations (the outer world) are only as complete as the receptors which evolved with the species enable them to perceive these irritations; nevertheless, they are always precise enough to make the species survive. For a bat, for instance, the "image" of the external world represents a series of *vacuities and densities*; for a black roach, objects are composed of "points" with various temperatures. Each sensation causes a corresponding active reaction related to it. As these "habits" (of the species) develop and as its reactions are diversified, the living organism begins to look for factors which condition its existence and to avoid others if they are harmful or destructive. The totality of these activities of animals represents their *behavior.*

In the process of long evolution, behavioral activity is consolidated in *unconditional reflexes* or *instincts* and is inherited. Among these instincts are those of defense, nutrition, reproduction, etc.

If living conditions change and are no longer in accordance with instinctive activities, new, *conditioned reflexes* appear. If the new conditions remain relatively stable for a number of generations, conditioned reflexes may become unconditional ones.

Conditioned reflexes are of major biological importance. They enable animals to find their place in the environment, to procure food, to avoid enemies and to adjust to the environment. If the situation is changed, conditioned reflexes also change, and this helps animals to adapt to the new conditions.

## Origin and Development of the Brain

Conditioned reflexes are temporary relationships. Yet, to maintain these relationships a *special* organ is needed. As demonstrated, monocellular organisms already have some elements which are more sensitive than others to the perception of individual environmental stimuli. With the advent of multicellular organisms, *cells specialize* into those receiving external irritations and transforming the energy of the irritation into the process of excitation. As animal organisms develop and become more complicated, a nervous system and its central section, the brain, gradually evolve from these (specialized) cells. *The brain is the central section of the nervous system in animals and man, which regulates the relationship of the organism with the environment and the interrelationship of functional processes* of various organs in animal or man.

In the *vertebrates,* the central section of the nervous system consists of the *spinal cord* and the *brain* with its different sections. With most fishes, the brain is relatively small and its hemispheres are underdeveloped. The brain of reptiles is more developed than that of fishes and the amphibians; it is here that the first nerve cells appear on the brain's surface to form the cortex. The brain is even more advanced in mammals. In higher mammals, the spreading cortex forms numerous fissures and convolutions, while the hemispheres cover the rest of the brain. In one manner or another, the brain feels the influence of the external or internal environment and is an intermediary whereby the animal or man react to the stimulus.

As noted, reflectory activity causes conditioned and unconditional reflexes, which in turn form the basis for individual variations in behavior, and finally lead to the emergence of new forms of mental reflection. These are perceptions, notions and emotions. Animals acquire a mentality with the basic elements of animal thinking. Yet, no matter how developed the mentality, it is still not a consciousness.

It follows that *although higher animals have a brain they still do not have a consciousness.* Consciousness is only inherent to man. *Consciousness*, therefore, *is a property of the human, as opposed to any other, brain.* If the origins of consciousness are to be determined, then, the origins of man with his specific brain must be found. Before we undertake and analysis of the problem of man's origins, however, let us present some evidence in support of the historical development of the organic world.

## Evidence to Support the Evolution of the Organic World and the Methodology for Its Study

Evidence to support the evolution of the organic world is already contained in Darwin's theory itself. Still, after Darwin a major volume of data has been collected which not only supports the fact of evolution itself but also gives some idea of the course of the process. The laws of the process are the subject of many sciences (biology, embryology, paleonthology, biogeography, etc.) yet it is not possible here to describe all their conclusions. The conclusions of dialectical-materialist philosophy on this issue are only based on the basic methods of study of evolution and its essential evidence.

The development and advance of life and its transition from the primitive to the higher stage are primarily supported by data provided by comparative anatomy. Its analysis of general structure of vertebrate animals demonstrates that, in spite of major difference in the exterior, way of life and behavior of vertebrate animals, they have much in common as far as their structure and positioning of organs are concerned. Double symmetry of the body, spine, skull, the brain and spinal cord, as well as the existence of two pairs of limbs pinpoint the common origins of all vertebrates.

Another important proof of common origins of all vertebrates are so-called *rudiments* (vestiges) and *atavisms.* Rudiments are organs which have lost their original importance in the process of evolution and are disappearing. A legless lizard, for one, has a rudimentary shoulder girdle. In birds, only the second toe has been preserved, while the first and third ones are rudimentary. The second and third digits in the foot of cows and pigs and the second and the fourth ones in horses are also rudimentary. Rudiments are an important demonstration of historical development of the organic world.

Atavisms are taken to mean recurrences of forms typical of ancestors. An example is a rare third pair of nipples on the cow's udder which shows that it descended from animals who had over four nipples. Another example is an occasional zebra-like coat of newborn foal or a black stripe on the back of a bay horse. This is a return to the coat coloration of wild ancestors of the domesticated horse. A most convincing demonstration of the common origins of all living things is the similarity of embryos. Embryos of different classes of vertebrates have, at early stages, strikingly similar body outlines, tails and rudimentary limbs, similar head shapes and gill pockets on tow sides of the gullet. It was already in the 1800s that German scientists Ferdinand Müller and Ernst Haeckel established what is called the biogenetical law which states that individual development of every animal is a brief recapitulation of historical development of the embryos of the given species. An example of the repetative forms are blood vessels in the embryos of all vertebrates, which radiate from the heart like gill arteries in fishes, and gill clefts and tail in the human foetus. These can only be attributable to the common origin of all living things.

Paleontological data can also serve to demonstrate the common origins of all living organisms. The earliest stratifications of the Earth's crust, for example, only contain remnants of invertebrates, while the subsequent ones have remnants of the chordates. Classes of vertebrates appeared on the Earth later. The later geological layers contain remnants of species and plants which are not unlike currently existing ones. Paleontological data thus provide a substantial body of information concerning the relations of continuity between various systematic groups. In some cases, *transitional forms* were established, while in others so-called *phylogenetic sequences* were found.

In particular, of major interest from the evolutionary viewpoint is the finding of an *Archaeopterix* in the shales of the Jurassic period of the Mesozoic era (about 200 million years ago). The animal which was the size of a pigeon had some features of birds while preserving those of reptiles. From birds it inherited a similarity of hind limbs with the pygostile and feathers, and general appearance. It was like vertebrates in that it had a long raw of tail vertebra, ventral ribs and teeth.

A phylogenetic sequence is a sequence of species where every successive species manifestly descends from and replaces the preceding one.

Paleontologists were able to establish the phylogenetic sequences of some ungulates, predators, cetaceans, etc. Russian scientists V. O. Kovalevsky, for instance, was able to trace the history of the horse on the basis of archeological findings. Its most ancient ancestor, Eohippus, who lived about 70 million years ago, was no larger than a fox, had four-toed front feet and three-toed hind feet as well as tuberculous teeth of the herbivorous type. It inhabited areas with a warm and humid climate and moved about in leaps amid tall grass and shrubs. About 25 million years ago the vegetation became drier and coarser; in open grass-covered plains only running could save the animals from their enemies as they had no other means of protection. Natural selection resulted in the extension of their legs and a smaller fulcrum (fewer toes came in contact with the ground), strengthening of the spine (which made faster running easier) and the formation of multituberculate teeth. As a result, the organism of the animals was completely restructured.

Thus, even after a brief survey of the basic facts established by natural science, the overall picture of development of life on Earth becomes clear. *Beginning with individual primitive organisms, the organisation of animals (and plants) gradually advanced as faunas (and floras) gradually approached their present forms.*

As animals with a highly developed brain evolved, prerequisites were established for their evolution, under certain circumstances, into man.

Let us examine these in greater detail.

## 2. The Origin of Man and Human Consciousness

### Man's Genealogy and the Role of Climate in the Ascent of Man

Modern anthropologists believe and their hypotheses have been repeatedly confirmed by science that man's genealogical tree descends to the primate known as the *Dryopithecus*, an anthropoid ape living in trees which appeared about 20 million years ago. Much later, the Dryopithecus evolved into three branches. *One* of these became the *ancetors* of large *apes–gorillas, chimpanzees and orangutangs*, the closest surviving "relatives" of man. *From the other branch, a creature called Gigantopithecus ascended;* it was a giant ape which roamed the plains of Asia (including those in the territory of Afghanistan) several million years ago only to become extinct subsequently.

*The third branch evolved into the Ramapithecus*, an anthropoid which is the remote ancestor of man.

The evolution of the Ramapithecus into man was related to a number of factors, including those which emerged long before the advent of the Ramapithecus. Scientists believe that it was largely due to continuous climatic changes on Earth.

As noted, a mountain formation process took place on this planet about 60 to 70 million years ago. These created a powerful barrier to the global circulation of winds. The barrier changed mean temperatures all over the globe. About fourteen million years ago, the tropical climate was replaced by a moderate one in many regions. The jungle became thinner while fruit and nuts which were usually in abundance throughout the year only appeared in certain seasons. The depletion of the food supply forced some animals to look for means of subsistence outside the woods. Some sylvan apes came out into savannas and grass-covered plains in search of roots, seeds, plants and, finally, flesh of other animals. It was due to these processes that the Ramapithecus originated. Having left the forest, it began developing rapidly, with the process of natural selection favoring those of the species who were able to stand firmly on their two feet.

## The Role of Vertical Posture and Hunting in the Ascent of Man

Their vertical posture enabled them to see their pray behind the tall grass and to pursue it as well as to spot predators in time to save themselves. *Vertical posture was the decisive step in the conversion of ape into man.* It freed its front limbs from the functions of propulsion and enabled it to use them for seizing and holding food. Subsequently it came to use the front limbs to throw stones or tree branches while attacking or defending themselves from other animals.

After many generations of selection, the inhabitants of the savanna evolved into creatures which moved about on two legs and were markedly different from their forest counterparts. This process took place about 8 to 5 million years ago. At the end of the period, the line of the anthropoids was subdivided into the following species: *Australopithecus robustus* and *Australopithecus africanus*, as well as *Homo*, the first creature approaching the definition of man. Again, the division was caused by a difference of habitats in the savanna. To compensate for the lack of food, *Australopithecus africanus* began eating meat which he procured not by hunting but by picking up what remained of the prey of larger predators. *Australopithecus robustus*, on the other hand, continued to subsist mainly on seeds and nuts. Both species finally became extinct due to their inability to compete with large predators or with *Homo*, who already displayed no small measure of ingenuity in his struggle for existence. He started to hunt. If hunting was to be successful, he needed certain implements. Initially these were stones and trees as he found them in nature. Later, the species started to pick up sharper and heavier stones and sometimes even attempted to "improve" them. Stones were sharpened and turned into primitive knives and spearheads.

## The Role of Labor in the Ascent of Man

The origins of *labor* are also traced back to the manufacture of the first *hunting implements.* In the process of labor, *hand developed*, acquiring increasing flexibility. As it was being improved, it enabled man to perform increasingly complicated manipulations.

The development of the hand could not take place without a general development of the organism. Food, for instance, was made less hard by processing and cooking on fire, which reduced the burden on the maxillaries. The sincipital crest to which powerful masticatory muscles are attached in apes lost its relevance and gradually disappeared. The skull became smooth. Changes were taking place in the skeleton (vertical posture) and internal organs, particularly in the *nervous system* and *sense organs.* The manufacture of implements, which required memorizing manipulations and reasoning, as well as a more advanced nervous system, resulted in a *larger and more sophisticated brain.*

## Social Life as a Factor in the Ascent of Man

To an even greater extent, the process was due to the social nature of life of man's ancestors, brought about by the need for hunting and working together. Labor was social originally, as, in the first place, even apes lived in herds. Secondly, individually man's ancestors were no match for animals which were stronger and more ferocious, and were unable to protect themselves from the elements. In a group, the task was made easier. Labor thus united individuals in a society. On the other hand, besides contributing to the development of labor, social life also contributed to the advance of man. In a group, it was easier to acquire working habits; the elders taught the young to look for natural materials and to manufacture implements, as well as hunting skills and preserving fire. It was easier for a group to defend itself from animals and to bring up children. With the development of social relations, the advantages of mutual support and assistance became increasingly obvious. Social life contributed to the improvement, from generation to generation and at an increasingly higher rate, of life experience accumulated in the cognition of nature, which, in turn, led to the development of man's intellectual abilities.

## Speech and its Importance for the Development of Man

Social life and joint labor brought fourth the need for *means* using which members of society would be able to coordinate their actions and exchange experiences, and, subsequently, thoughts. Originally, individual sounds uttered by them, gestures and facial expressions served as such a means. Yet as their activities advanced, the sounds became insufficient. A vital need arose for an organ of speech. The underdeveloped larynx and oral cavity underwent a number of changes which resulted in man's ability to articulate. This enabled our ancestors to differentiate the sounds they uttered as regards their tone, intonation and duration, etc., until finally human speech appeared, composed of sounds improved in the process of labor.

The improvement of speech, in turn, contributed to increasing the volume of information transmitted, accelerated the development of work implements and of thinking abilities of primitive men. This gave birth to new needs, led to new types of labor activity, brought new knowledge and entailed the development of the brain, as well as a broader and more profound *comprehension* of the surrounding world.

The acquisition of speech by our ancestors is practically tantamount to the acquisition of *thinking,* which made their life more purposeful and less dependent on biological factors, while increasing its dependence on social ones. Natural selection in evolution was gradually losing its role as the leading factor. While in animals special experience was transmitted via mechanisms of heredity and was the only factor determining the preservation and development of individual species, in man the transfer of vital experience began to take place in the process of joint labor by means of speech. The existence of mankind became dependent on the improvement of productive activities rather than on a biological adaptation to the environment. On the basis of all this, Frederick Engels made a general conclusion that *labor, speech and social life are the basic factors of conversion of ape into man and are the basic prerequisites for further development of the latter.* It was under the influence of these stimuli that the ape brain became the specifically human brain; man acquired an ability to cognize the world and to transform it. Finally, *Homo sapiens,* the thinking man, capable of understanding and changing the world, evolved.

## The Essence of Consciousness

*It was man's ability to relate to objects of the outside world with understanding and knowledgeably that was called consciousness.*

*Thus, consciousness is man's ability to use the brain to reflect the surrounding world, to perceive it knowledgeably and to act upon it in accordance with his needs.*

For consciousness to emerge, an extended period of evolution of non-organic matter into organic (live) matter, the emergence of living organisms and their evolution into higher animals possessing a brain and elementary mentality were required. Specific conditions also had to be formed in the habitat to enable the ancestral man to rely on labor, social life and speech, to be isolated from the animal world, to acquire a specifically human brain and numerous social features which make him different from animals, and to acquire a consciousness.

It follows from the above that:

1. There is and can be no other way for consciousness to evolve other than through the evolution of matter. There can be no consciousness anywhere which would exist "ready-made", would have appeared all of a sudden or all by itself. Nor can it be "created". There is no "universal consciousness", "universal reason" or "universal idea" either; even if they existed on all planets, they would have had to appear only as a result of development of matter. Yet science incontrovertibly asserts that there is no consciousness which would exist "universally". Creatures of reason can only appear on those planets where the required objective conditions are formed. It follows that there is and can be no consciousness which would exist without matter, before matter, or, more, would "give birth" to matter and the entire universe. In actual fact, the situation is quite the opposite. In the course of its development matter becomes living matter and upon the expiration of billions of years, under the influence of numerous factors, evolves into consciousness.

2. As living matter, and consequently consciousness, evolve from non-living matter, materialists' views that matter is primary and consciousness secondary find yet another substantiation. As for the existing notions of "universal reason", "universal spirit", etc., they are but inventions of men going back to the time when they did not know the essence of the world and used to endow it, after their own likeness, with an ability to "think" and "create", believing that instead of them, this was done by some unfathomable force, heaven, "god" or "universal reason".

For lack of proof to support the existence of the "universal reason" and "universal idea", idealists "launch appeals" to distrust materialists' conclusions, including those concerned with the origin of man and his consciousness. That is quite understandable, as these conclusions undermine the idealists' views. And if the idealists still have a body of followers, it is largely because many of them are unfamiliar with the conclusions of science in this respect. Let us take a look at some of the conclusions.

## Evidence to Support the Descent of Man from the Animal World

A comparison of skeletons of man and other vertebrates convincingly shows that they have common structures: the skull, the skeleton and the limb bones. The same bones, albeit of various shapes and degrees of development are contained both in the skeleton of man and in those of animals. Man is a mammal as he has all the features of the class: womb development, mammary glands, teeth of three types (molars, canines and incisors), three hearing bones in the middle ear and cochleae.

Rudiments are of special importance as a demonstration of the descent of man from the animal world as well as of historical development of animals. In man, the rudiments are: the presence on the skin of an insignificant number of short haires, vestiges of the full coat of our simian ancestors; a rudiment in the inner corner of the eye, well developed in birds, reptiles and some other animals, including fishes and amphibians. The coccyx of man's skeleton is also rudimentary; it consists of four (less often of five) underdeveloped and fused vertebrae. The appendix, the wormlike blindly ending extension of the cecum which many mammals use to digest food, has lost its original importance. There are some ear muscles that are redundant in man but which play a noticeable role in animals when they try to catch a sound.

People are sometimes born with features of their remote ancestors, like a tail, a thick coat of hair or extra nipples.

The similarity of man to other vertebrates is also reflected in the development of the embryo. Initially it has gill clefts like fish embryos; the original heart is a tube with pulsating walls reminiscent of the pulsation of some vessels in lancelets. At the age of 1.5 months the human embryo, like those of other vertebrates, has a tail with up to ten vertebrae which subsequently degenerates into the coccyx. The big toe is shorter than the others and is positioned at an angle to them, like that of an ape. In a grown man it is longer than the rest, is parallel to them and is a point of support during walking. The brain of a month-old human embryo consists of five separate parts—brain bubbles, positioned in line one after another, not unlike the fish brain. Large hemispheres gradually advance on the other sections. Fissures and convolutions appear on the cortex which enlarge the surface of the brain. Yet even in a seven-month-old foetus, the brain still resembles that of a baboon. Peculiar similarity is found in the foetuses of ape and man. At earlier stages of development they are virtually indistinguishable.

Structurally and physiologically, anthropoid apes, orangutangs, gorillas, chimpanzees and their close relatives gibbons, are the closest to man of all animals. These apes are very much like man in that they express their emotions, like those of joy, anger and grief; they caress their offspring, care for them and punish them for disobedience. It has been experimentally established that they are capable of using nearby objects as primitive implements. The apes have highly developed unconditional and conditioned reflexes. Yet, the apes only have so-called object mentality, which means that they perceive the outside world in terms of stimuli acting directly on their sense organs. They are unable to generalize, to abstract themselves from objects, i.e. to think in terms of concepts of the objects. Anthropoid apes have no tail; they can walk on hind legs but still support themselves by hands. They have fingernails, rather than claws, on their fingers, 12 to 13 pairs of ribs, 5 to 6 sacral vertebrae, and the number of molars, canines and incisors is equal to that in man. The similarity of skeletal structure and internal organs of ape and man is striking. The structure of man's ears, eyes and skin is very similar to that of anthropoid apes. All of this is a demonstration of their indisputable relationship.

A vast difference does exist, nevertheless, between man and anthropoid apes. Human life is based on labor, on the manufacture and utilisation of work implements. Man lives in society and is subject to the laws of its development, i.e. socio-economic laws. Besides, he has a number of anatomical and physiological peculiarities. The volume of the human brain is about 1,400 to 1,600 cu cm while that of the anthropoid ape is 600 cu cm. The cortex surface of a man's brain hemisphere averages 1,250 sq cm while in the anthropoid ape it is about 3.5 times as small. In man, fissures and convolutions are highly developed, as well as frontal and temporal lobes related to the most important centers of higher mental activity. People possess articulate speech which enables them to communicate, to accumulate and to transmit life and work experience from one generation to another. Man is capable of abstract thinking and of advancing various sciences and arts, whereas apes possess none of these abilities. Thus the statement that any ape is an immediate ancestor of man would not be correct.

Still, this is not to cast doubts on the fact of man's descent from the animal world. That the path of development was not direct, but was influenced by numerous factors, is another matter.

## 3. Consciousness and the Brain. Consciousness vs. the Soul

An approach to consciousness as a property of matter does not yet reveal its essence in its entirety. As stated above, it is not the brain as such that is the source of consciousness but the *world reflected* by man by means of the brain. For a more profound understanding of the essence of consciousness, therefore, the question has to be considered of man's interaction with the environment in the process of comprehending it, the functioning of the brain as it reflects the environment, and the formation of individual ideas and thinking in general, as mentality is not identical to physiological mechanisms of psychic phenomena.

This has to be done because idealist philosophers, while speculating on the fact that sensuous image and concepts, being ideal reflections of the outside world, are not material *per se*, undertake to represent consciousness as something supernatural in an attempt to mislead those who analyze science's conclusions.

## The Brain's Reflectory Activity

Materialist philosophers, while opposing a simplistic interpretation of the essence of consciousness by proponents of vulgar materialism, and while acknowledging the difficulty of revealing the nature of all mechanisms of consciousness and thinking, still see no basis for confusion here. Consciousness or thinking, no matter how supernatural or supersensual they may seem, are still real products of man's interaction with the environment by means of his material, body organ—the brain.

First, science has convincingly shown that there is no consciousness or thinking without the brain or a corresponding mechanism of communication. Secondary, science has now penetrated the secret of functioning of the brain itself, obtaining a sufficient number of facts to support the statement that consciousness, or thinking, is based on material factors and is secondary, and to demonstrate that biological processes which cause sensations, perceptions and notions followed by concepts, judgements and conclusions, are natural. It has been established, in particular, that each brain cell (there are about 15 billion of these in the human brain) interacts with thousands of others, establishing a whole system of interrelationships both among the cells and as regards internal and external nerve endings of sense organs, as well as with other sections of the brain. The interrelationship and interaction within nerve fibers and the organism's responses to individual environmental influences represent *reflectory activity*. According to Russian scientist I.M. Sechenov (1829-1905), the process has what can be seen as *three stages.*

*At the first stage,* the environment influences the sense organs, or the environment's subject, to cause what can be described as an external stimulus, which is then transformed by the sense organs into the process of nervous excitation and via receptors (i.e. endings of sensitive nerve fibers or specialized cells) is transmitted to the brain. In the brain, certain relationships (structures of an image) are established in strict accordance with the structure of what is being reflected. If an electromagnetic wave, for example, hits the retina of an eye which contains photosensitive substances, photochemical processes begin in the retina, one caused by the light waves' energy, and others by internal energy of the photosensitive substances. The processes, in turn, generate what is called the *action current* which is transmitted, as discreet pulses, through nerve fibers to the central part of the analyzer. In the central part of the analyzer, they are redistributed among primary projection zones (sight, hearing, etc.) and projected onto a point located in the rear part of the brain, causing individual *sensations* in the occipital sections of the cortex. Of these sensations, a single image of the object is built. Each pulse "selects" one of all the possible states of the cortex, e.g. that of red color, and the process of information analysis begins. As a result, certain relationships are formed within the brain, which are based on the nature of what is being reflected and are in strict accordance with its structure. In other words, a subjective image of the objective object is created in the brain, and although the nature of the image is different from that of the objective object, one still strictly corresponds to the other and the image is the object's exact reproduction in consciousness. Thus perceptions of the reflected object and a *notion* of it are created.

*At the second stage,* nervous processes take place in the brain (excitation and inhibition) which accompany the analysis and comparison of sensations resulting from the interaction with the external object of perceptions and notions based on them, with information contained in the memory from previous experience.

*At the third stage,* the ensuing reactions and thought processes enable man, by using complex mechanisms of the entire nervous system of the body, to respond and to interact with the reflected object.

Nervous processes and reactions are thus at all stages closely interrelated, both as regards one another and vis-à-vis the environment. It follows that all man's actions and deeds are conditioned by man's interaction with the environment. The original cause of any action always lies in an external irritation of the senses, as lacking it no thought is possible. This also explains why consciousness is not an act of simple passive contemplation or subjective experience; it represents a subjective prerequisite for practical activities and regulates human behavior and actions. Only since the energy of external stimuli transformed into corresponding irritations is reflected in practical activities, the consolidation of conditioned relationships characterizing the level of consciousness is possible.

## The Conception of a Signal System

Words, signs, etc., can cause exactly the same associations and relationships leading to the formation of conditioned reflexes, as material stimuli do. It is possible, however, only due to the fact that the words in this case play the role of *the signal of other signals,* the latter being material stimuli proper. In other words, a material stimulus is a peculiar signal influencing the sense organs. The word denoting this signal is *the signal of a signal.* It is this that enables man to cognize any object, including one he has not seen.

The system of relationships of conditioned reflexes, formed in the cortex of large hemispheres of the brain by pulses caused by external and internal stimuli, is *the first signal system.* Man and animals alike have it. Man, however, has another, a more sophisticated and advanced system. Its origin in man is related to social labor and speech. Russian scientists I. P. Pavlov (1849-1936) called it *the second signal system.*

Idealists attempt to reject the dependence of consciousness on external factors and on the reflected environment on the basis of the fact that men have both misconceptions and notions of things non-existent in real nature's processes. These attempts, however, are unsubstantiated, as misconceptions and erroneous notions are the result of a distorted reflection of reality by man.

Another argument used by the opponents of materialism is that men often use notions which do not exist and have never existed in nature, like mathematical notions. There is nothing in nature to correspond to these notions. Therefore they are a reflection of nothing.

True, it is impossible to find a mathematical concept, like "the square root of 2", in nature. Still, idealists miss the fact that notions of numbers, planes, etc., which are not found in nature while existing in human consciousness, are possible because in his activities man reflects the environment in a selective, rather than in a general, manner, most often in its substantial aspects required for practical activities in abstraction from all the rest. The abstract nature of mathematical concepts (and of all basic concepts, for that matter) does not interfere with their being a reflection of definite properties and relations of the real world. Man's ability to reflect essential relationships selectively and to think in abstract terms largely contributes to an effective manifestation of what is described as advance reflection, which enables man not only to have physiological (instinctive) premonitions of events, but also to predict their course and results relying on cognized laws of the objective world. This enables man to influence the world in an active manner and to transform it in accordance with his goals and ideas.

On the basis of the above, a number of basic conclusions can be made concerning the essence of consciousness and thinking.

1. Thinking is a reflection of objective reality, which makes the process of thinking as law-governed as reality is. There is consequently nothing supernatural or mysterious in it. Not created by anyone, it is a result of protracted development of matter and man's interaction with the environment.

2. Thinking takes place in the form of notions, judgements and conclusions which make it specific. It has its own laws which are studied by logic.

3. As regards its laws and forms, thinking is common to all men, independently of their class, national and race origins, i.e., it is inherent in all men. This has been convincingly shown by logic and practice which has refuted all kinds of racist theories concerning the "superiority" of some races and "inferiority" of others.

4. Thinking is active rather than passive; inherent in it is man's capability of creative activities of transformation. This particular aspect of thinking and consciousness has to be dealt with in greater detail.

## The Active Role of Consciousness

The fact that consciousness is secondary vis-à-vis matter and that it represents a subjective image of the objective world, does not yet entail that it plays no role in man's practical activities or that it is secondary in nature. Dialectical materialist philosophy rejects the metaphysical viewpoint that consciousness has no real effect on the life of man and society. Dialectical materialist philosophy, as a science, convincingly shows that man can adjust to the environment, make it serve his requirements and create the environment necessary for his vital activities only because he is endowed with consciousness and because of his social activities.

It was Hegel who said that the human mind is not only powerful but also clever. Its "cleverness" consists in man's ability to use various inventions to utilize natural objects to his own ends in pursuance of his own goals. On the other hand, this conscious ability and its active nature are not an independent spiritual force originating in some supernatural spirit lacking a material basis. Dialectical materialist philosophy explains the active nature of consciousness proceeding from the fact that it is based on objective reality; only since consciousness is a reflection of the objective world can man find a place of his own in this world, interact with it, change it and subordinate it to his needs. In the process, man's behavior, as opposed to that of animals, is based on results of comparisons and analyses, on the selection of one option out of all possible attitudes to reality based on his experience of interaction with the environment, which is incessantly being enriched, rather than on a program based on the species' experience, and aimed at satisfaction of biological instincts and needs. It is only on the basis of genuine practical experience and accurate knowledge of existing aspects of objective reality, that man is capable of more than selecting the best options for his interrelationship with reality; he can also draw up plans for his activities in the future and to set certain goals. Thus ideal models of the desired future appear, and goals are set which determine the mode and nature of man's practical activities in their entirety, including those which change and transform the world. It is of this that Lenin in one of his works wrote: "the world does not satisfy man, and man decides to change it by his activity."[1]

Yet what man transforms is not just the universe and not the universe alone; he also transforms the social world. Again, this is done not by individual men, but by men jointly, by a society of men. Besides, consciousness, as we have already seen, is the result not so much of biological, as of social development. Man's consciousness, then, should be aimed not only at transforming the natural environment and subordinating it to man, but also at transforming and creating some second world, a *social environment*, which is the most important prerequisite for his continued life and vital activities.

Transforming, changing and creating the social environment mean transforming and creating, primarily, adequate material conditions of social life, and changing social relations in the interests of men. Yet, if man is to be successful at this, his consciousness must be emancipated from all that is unreasonable and obscuring its clarity, that makes it not free and dependent on a supernatural force, "omnipotent will", etc.

Of importance here is development of man's self-consciousness. Self-consciousness begins with an awareness of one's knowledge, talents and abilities as opposed to their assessment by others. By comparing himself to others, man develops an ability for self-analysis, for analysing his actions, intentions and future deeds.

It is important to understand what one feels, what in the surrounding world makes one suffer and what makes one happy. What has one done to make the world better, more reasonable and just, what is one's social position, class affiliation and occupation, what one actually represents as a member of society, one's class and state?

Having become aware of this, it is equally important to take effective action aimed at improving oneself and the society.

It then becomes clear why development of individual and social consciousness and greater social involvement of men is currently a basic social task. It is only on the basis of profound popular awareness of objective natural and social laws and of development and improvement of social activities that effective transformations in the interests of humanity are possible.

There are some who believe that their social role, personal life and individual actions are determined by the nature of the soul which enters them at birth, exists in man independently of consciousness and even conditions it. Thus, they hold, it is no use trying to improve and develop one's consciousness and to challenge destiny and one's soul. Is this, in effect, true? Does the soul really exist?

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "Conspectus of Hegel's Book *The Science of Logic*", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p. 213.

## Consciousness and the Soul

The problem of the soul is an ancient problem. It may be recalled that the ancients saw the soul as something material (like a shadow, blood, breath, etc.). Subsequently the soul was seen as an incorporeal and immortal force which had an independent existence in isolation from the body. Idealist philosophers, including, in particular, Hegel, as already noted, regarded the soul, as the most primitive, sensuous manifestation of spirit in its relationship with matter. Thus Hegel talked about a sensuous and active soul.

Some philosophical theories use the term "soul" as synonymous to that of *mind* .People are sometimes described as having "a kind heart" or being "good souls".

Dialectical materialist philosophy holds that what men have is consciousness, *not a soul.* The level of consciousness determines all men's psychological and spiritual activities. A man is only as kind or vicious as his consciousness, which has been developed by upbringing and education, makes him. Men do not have "a kind heart", nor are they "good souls"; these are just conventional descriptions. The heart proper is no more than a physiological organ circulating blood throughout the human body; it has neither psychological nor moral qualities. In this sense, it is the same in all men. "A good soul" and "a kind-hearted man" only means that someone is wise and well-educated and that his wisdom and education prevent him from being indifferent to other people and their sorrows or to injustice.

In other words, all spiritual qualities or traits of a man are largely determined by the level of his consciousness and his education. This is confirmed, for example, by the fact that a disorder or a physiological injury of the brain with an ensuing loss of consciousness result in psychological disorders or a loss of intellectual ability. Depending on which section of the brain has been injured, and how much, the result is sometimes incessant laughter and liveliness, and sometimes the opposite—depression and inhibition; the injured may be either calm or violent and aggressive, etc. A serious injury of the entire brain results in a total loss of consciousness and cessation of all mental activity. Yet sometimes, if the activity of the brain cells is restored, after a car crash for example, the injured "regains" consciousness.

There have been cases of loss of memory lasting for two or three weeks. The injured were unable to describe what happened while they were unconscious. There are other examples. Someone is dying of a heart disease... Clinical death occurs, which is the state of absence of visible life signs, like cardiac activity or breathing, and of gradual failure of the central nervous system. From the point of view of some, "the soul" is leaving the body and going to heaven, to Paradise or Hell, as the case may be. Yet if the patient gets a heart transplant (provided this is done within several minutes after death while the decomposition of the brain has not begun) and oxygen is fed to the body and the brain, the patient is revived. He feels he was asleep and remembers nothing of his death. The patient has thus "returned from beyond" and has found nothing there. What happened to "the soul", one might ask? Was it in no hurry to "go to heaven" and stayed in the body while the man was dead? Or was it that the surgeon had supernatural abilities and could, if he so wished, deliver "the soul" from "heaven" and return it to the dead thus reviving the latter?

Actually, none of the above took place. The consciousness did not go to "heaven", it merely disappeared as vital functions of the brain ceased. Yet, as the doctors, using entirely material means, operate on the body and the brain, making them resume functioning, consciousness returns also. If they fail to revive the body and the brain, consciousness does not return either. It is because brain activity ceases that consciousness, and consequently all spiritual activity, is lost irrevocably. Science thus provides yet another argument in support of dependence of all man's spiritual qualities on the level of his consciousness. Indirectly, this is demonstrated by another experiment. The head of a vicious white dog was cut off and sutured onto the body of a quiet black dog. Conversely, the head of the black dog was sutured onto the body of the white one. In other words, the dogs' heads changed bodies. It was then found that the dogs' tempers also changed. The white-headed black dog became vicious and the white one with the black head, calm. The animals' behavior was thus shown to be entirely dependent on their heads, or more precisely, on the brain, its degree of development, training, etc.

The functions of other body organs had no influence on the animals' behavior. There can therefore be no doubt that science's conclusions that man's mental activity is conditioned by objective processes related to the functioning of the brain are substantiated. A claim that consciousness, or "the soul", can exist in isolation from the body is like saying that when a black cat leaves the room its black color remains inside. It is even less justified to believe that this could be accomplished by the mythical "soul". There is thus no need to relate human life to the concept of "the soul" thus giving man hope that "the soul" can be "saved", "go to heaven", etc.

It is in this sense that man has no pre-determined "destiny" or spiritual qualities which would be heaven-sent or inherited; consciousness and the spiritual world of man are more than what can be described as intrapersonal being. They are formed and exist independently of the personality in scientific discoveries, artistic creations, legal and moral standards, etc., and under their influence. All the manifestations of social consciousness are a *sine qua non* of the formation of individual personal consciousness.

Individual and social consciousness form an indivisible whole. Individual consciousness is based not only on social consciousness but also on specific activities and social practice. Consciousness and the objective world are opposites forming a untiy. The unity is based on practice, intensive sensual and objective activities finding their expression in human labor, class struggle and scientific experiment. All this is the best proof of the fact that man's spiritual world cannot be formed by itself, under the influence of "the soul", or some inborn incorporeal being. Man's spiritual wealth, merits and demerits depend on man himself and are of his own making.

## Consciousness and Speech

As we already know, the essence of consciousness and its degree of development are also related to language and articulate speech.

The basic "units" of speech are the word and the phrase. The word represents the unity of meaning and sound. The material aspect of the word (its pronunciation and image in writing) *designates* an object and is called a *sign.* As for the word's meaning, it reflects the object and is a sensuous or intellectual *image.* In spite of the fact that there are different words, or signs, in different languages to denote the same object (English table, German *Der Tisch*, Russian *стол*), and in this sense the link between the object and the word is seemingly conditional, what the words denote is nevertheless not, as they designate the required objects and phenomena. This means that the signs and words used by men are not something brought in from outside, independently of their practical activities; they came into usage as a result of their reflection of nothing but activity. That it was in the process of labor that men acquired an ability for speech communication is shown by the following: where social labor is underdeveloped, speech is not developed sufficiently either. Advanced societies have richer and more advanced languages. At the same time, there are remote corners on Earth and tribes where the language is merely incipient: there are no words for certain objects, activities, or generalising words. To describe a *white bear* or a *brown bear*, for instance, the concepts "a bear on an ice-flow" and "a bear living in the woods" are used, etc. This is evidence of insufficient social practice in the tribes and of the lack of a social need for more general words. Conversely, even a most advanced language is enriched with new words and changes its structure as production develops and social relations are improved. This causes many languages to disappear while others are still emerging. For example, two thousand "dead languages" are currently known, formerly in active usage but not in use any more, as they are not in accordance with the requirements of current practice. Thus, whatever the language used by men, they can easily (with the help of interpreters) communicate, since any language, in some way or another, is a reflection of reality and social practice. On the same grounds, one can talk about the similarity of thinking of peoples, no matter which nation they are part of or which language they speak, since, as already mentioned, any language reflects the social practice and the surrounding world in a similar, or identical, manner. This refutes the myth spread by bourgeois ideologists that some peoples with advanced languages are superior and "capable of self-government", while others, with underdeveloped languages, are "inferior" and need somebody else to govern them.

Besides natural languages (oral and written speech), there are numerous man-made systems used as a means of communication, like signs, mathematical and chemical formulae, the Morse code, light and other signal systems.

Artificial sign systems serve the purpose of expressing ideas unambiguously and in a condensed form, while reflecting, besides the result, also the process of solution of a problem.

All of this demonstrates time and again that the world's peoples have common origins, are subject to the same basic laws of development, think and develop their thinking in accordance with these laws, and are moving toward, and will finally arrive, at essentially a common style of thinking, the scientific one. The existing diversity of political, legal, philosophical and religious views and outlooks, based on various modes of production of material goods or on their consequences, will in the end be replaced by a single dialectical and materialist world outlook.

## Conclusions

The problem of origins of life and man and of his ability to think, of his consciousness has been solved by science to a sufficient degree. A mere one hundred years ago the mechanistic materialist and agnostic, Emil Du Bois-Reymond (1818-1896) considered these problems insoluble. He was the author of the well-known phrase, "We do not know and shall not know". Dialectical materialist philosophy, relying on achievements of natural science, has refuted this notion by scientifically substantiating its conclusions. The assumption made by primitive men, followed by some idealist philosophers, that consciousness is the activity of a special incorporeal being, the soul, has not been confirmed. Science fully supports the main premise of dialectical materialist philosophy that consciousness is a result of a long-term development of matter, the emergence of life on Earth, the coming into being of man, and his intensive activity of transformation.

Science has shown that consciousness is not static. It never ceases to develop with the development of the world it reflects. Still, the development of consciousness is also based on other factors, and in particular on social conditions, scientific advances and the nature of a given era, which either serve as incentives or as obstacles to the process. The rate of development of social consciousness is currently especially high. At this stage of rapid revolutionary transformations, entire peoples are gaining access to the current level of consciousness. This depends, however, on the nature of social relations established in the course of the transformations.

The task which follows is establishing social conditions which would offer everyone equal opportunities for comprehensive development, including spiritual development and that of consciousness. These can only be created in a society with no exploitation of man by man, where all kinds of efforts are aimed at the development of consciousness. These are the conditions which are being established in the countries which have recently won their independence and have embarked on the road of transforming their societies along democratic lines. Yet if the problem is to be solved in its entirety, large-scale and active efforts and civil responsibility of hundreds of thousands of the best representatives of the nations will be required.

### *Test Questions*

1. How did life on Earth originate? What is life?
2. Which factors served to turn primitive living organisms into higher animals?
3. What were the conditions and factors contributing to the isolation of man from the animal world?
4. What is consciousness?
5. Does man have a "soul"?
6. What is the role of consciousness in the life of man and society?
7. What has to be done to develop and improve individual and social consciousness?

## *Chapter V*

# DEVELOPMENT OF THE WORLD AND ITS LAWS

We have already found out in analyzing the nature of the surrounding world and the origin of life, man and human consciousness that the world is not only in constant motion and change but is also *developing.*

At the same time, since representatives of different schools of philosophical thought have different views of nature and the surrounding world, the development of the world is still interpreted in various ways and there are distorted concepts of the character of development and attempts are made to deny scientific achievements prompted by the development of the world.

The questions: "What is meant by development?", "What are the character and direction of development?" and "What is the source of development?" cause particularly heated disputes.

## Basic Concepts of Development

*Metaphysics* and *dialectics* are the two doctrines which propagate particularly different views on questions of development.

Metaphysical thinkers assert that nature develops exclusively through small, gradual and continuous quantitative changes, through evolution, without any leaps, that is, dramatic qualitative changes.

One of the founders of this school of thought was English philosopher and sociologist Herbert Spenser (1820-1903). Development, according to Spenser, proceeds smoothly, without the slightest breaks of continuity but solely through the quantitative accretion of elements. Stages of the evolutionary process differ from one another only quantitatively but never qualitatively. In other words, Spenser, followed by other metaphysical thinkers, holds that all things in existence move and change but do not evolve into something new. For instance: I am thirsty, I am very thirsty, I am very very thirsty ... but as soon as I take some water, I am no longer thirsty again. Changes in me after

I have quenched my thirst have returned me to my initial state, as it were. Hence, any motion, change and development may be represented as a ring, a circle, in which the initial point is at the same time the finishing point. In this way development is interpreted as a process of repetition, a movement in a circle—and therefore is denied.

Metaphysical thinkers do not recognize the property of self-development in matter and do not realise that development is born of nature itself and is intrinsic to it. That is why they either pass over in silence the source of development or impute it to supernatural forces.

The glaring fallacy of the metaphysical concept and its inconsistency with facts gave rise to another concept, which is seemingly opposite to the first one but actually just as metaphysical. It came to be known as the "creative evolution" theory. While avowed metaphysical thinkers regarded development as a sum of quantitative changes only, the proponents of "creative evolution" regard it as only qualitative change. According to them, development is "creative" and consists in the emergence of new forms. However, they do not relate these qualitative changes to preceding quantitative changes and claim that the appearance of something new in the process of development cannot be explained by natural causes and that it depends mostly on the "creative force" which directs development and produces new forms.

The concept of *idealist dialectics* is no less fallacious. Representatives of this school of thought recognize the ability for development only in the spiritual, in the "absolute spirit", or in the human mind. The development of the world as such is denied. They hold that it can be transformed only in the sense that it is the process of the materialization of the "idea". This view grossly distorts the nature of the processes actually taking place, narrows them down and reduces development only to one aspect of reality, viz. thought. It is therefore clear that this concept in no way reflects the nature of the dynamics of the surrounding world.

The concept of materialist dialectics proceeds first and foremost from the assumption that development is objective and material because it is the objective world that develops while the mind reflects this development. *Development is the irreversible, purposeful and law-governed change of material and ideal objects.* It proceeds from the simple to the complex, from the lower to the higher, from the old qualitative state to a new, higher qualitative state. The source of development consists in inner contradictions of matter which result in the struggle of opposite forces and tendencies operating within the given phenomenon.

## 1. Development as a Dialectical Process

The brief materialist dialectical definition of development given above indicates that development is not merely motion, change, nor simple transition from one qualitative state to another but a process which is irreversible and controversial, proceeding along a rising line, or spiral. As has been noted above, every type of motion involves contradiction; every type of motion eventually brings about a quantitative change which alters the measure of a thing or process, with the resultant transition into a new qualitative state. But not every motion or quantitative and qualitative change represent development in the full sense of the word. For instance, the reversible process of the conversion of water into ice or steam cannot be called development. Qualitative changes which actually are the destruction of certain structures cannot be considered development in the precise sense of the word either. The installation of the fascist regime in Chile in 1973, which threw the country back decades, is not an act of development. *Development is a process of qualitative transformations producing objects of a higher level and more complex structure, improved objects.*

What does it mean?

We have already seen that the world is infinitely diverse not only in its external manifestations but also in its internal structure and its forms of interrelationship and interaction. This means that from the outset every component of this structure is different from its other components. These different components, interrelated within the given structure, interact between themselves, each of them changing accordingly. The greater the change of one component or another, the greater the differences between them. All this means that a process of *differentiation* (dismemberment) is constantly growing within every structure and every organism. Differentiation is the division of a single whole into relative opposites of different types, which at the same time retain their intrinsic unity. The interaction of these opposites, having a certain degree of unity, gives rise to contradiction, which is the source of development.

Development, furthermore, is a process determined not only by the degree of differentiation but also by the character of relations between different components of a system and between systems. Every emergent system, existing within a definite environment, is itself a component of another system.

This broader system incorporates elements of different levels of organisation, some simple and others more complex, so the possibilities for the change and development of each of them are bound in a complex system of direct and feedback dependencies.

The world around man makes up a picture of vastly diverse phenomena. But however dissimilar these phenomena are, all of them are related to one another in different ways.

For instance, organic and inorganic nature, living and inanimate matter, despite their substantial differences, are bound by the unity of their chemical components and laws of development; the mechanical, physical and biological forms of motion can evolve into one another; social life is indissolubly linked with nature, etc.

That was why Engels noted that when we study nature or human history we find before ourselves a picture of the infinite intertwining of relations and interrelations between the objects and phenomena of the real world.

For this reason development cannot be represented as a predetermined process which is independent from the totality of interrelated subsystems. It is hard to imagine the development or organisms out of the context of the physical conditions of their existence and the character of their influence on one another.

There was a time when man scrutinized and studied the objects, processes and phenomena he came across in his immediate surroundings virtually every day. But it turned out that an in-depth understanding of these processes, phenomena and objects calls for studying them in close relationship with global problems, that is, in the context of the Earth as a whole. Man soon realized, however, that he had to understand in one way or another the functioning of the solar system in order to know the causes of changes taking place on Earth. It turned out, too, that an understanding of all the problems of the functioning of the solar system requires an analysis of its relationship and interaction with the billions of stars making up the galaxy. But the latter does not set bounds to the world around us: it is influenced by billions of other galaxies which form the Metagalaxy. This list can be continued indefinitely.

It is therefore natural that the evolution of life on Earth and the history of human society only constitute relatively independent fragments of the grandiose process of the evolution of the Universe. If we bear in mind that the development processes of, say, living organisms depend on their relationship with other similar organisms, we will see why it is impossible to predict with any degree of accuracy the future course of evolution of one species of plants or animals or another and to picture terrestrial fauna and flora in a million years. Indeed, if the evolution of living nature constituted merely the consistent transition of all creatures from the lower stages of organization to the higher, we would have today only higher forms and the problem of progress would be easy to resolve. But in reality, as we have already seen, the evolutionary process has a far more complex character because of multilayer relationships within it. That is why the process of development with its complex relationships has every now and then been mediated by chance and actually depends on chance. It therefore cannot be viewed as a single and universal process of ascension from the lower to the higher. Indeed, it includes breaks, setbacks and halts in development. For the same reason it manifests itself in different forms, in particular, as development in nature, society and thinking.

Lastly, the development of the more complex systems, such as living protein compounds, is determined by certain mediators, matrixes, which are hereditary programs precluding multivalence in the combination of elements and ensuring the mode of forming protein molecules that is characteristic of the given organism and therefore the process of development that is typical of this species. Due to the role of these programs the development process, although stipulated by numerous external factors, can be regarded as a process of self-development, "self-organisation". In other words, the matrix ensures the stability and preservation of the species.

What conclusions can be drawn from all this?

To begin with, it is necessary to distinguish between simple change, motion and repetition, on the one hand, and development, on the other. We should also distinguish between *evolution* and *development.* Development is not a uniform process of quantitative or qualitative change but a sequence of changes of the material system, which eventually results in the struggle of opposites.

An obligatory aspect of the process of development is simple evolution, in particular, quantitative growth. Initially slight quantitative changes reach a certain level and bring about basic qualitative changes. This transition, moreover, takes the form of leaps, revolutionary outbursts, "breaks in continuity". Since transition into a new qualitative state takes place so that everything best and viable of the old quality is not rejected but preserved, a new quality contains a repetition of the old and a return to it, as it were, but at a higher level of organization. If we represent this process in a chart, it will be not a straight line nor a circle, but a kind of spiral, with slumps, setbacks and sharp leaps. In other words, development proceeds along a rising zigzag-like spiral.

The process of development encompasses every aspect of the real world, and all its individual components are interrelated, interdependent and affected by chance in one way or another. For this reason development is characterized by the emergence and growth of some systems and, as a consequence, the transformation and zero growth of others.

All this complex, interrelated and self-generating process of the material and spriritual world is referred to as the *dialectical process* (the word "dialectic" in ancient Greece meant the art of debate). This term is used to denote all the relationships and processes of the objective world which are characterized by contradictions, unity, struggle, negation, revolutionary transformation, victory of the new over the old, transition from the lower to the higher, etc. In this case we speak about "the dialectics of the objective world," "objective dialectics," "the dialectical character" of the processes taking place, etc.

The dialectical processes of the development of the real world are very complex. The dialectical development of the world cannot be characterized as development in one direction, ascending (progressive) or descending (regressive). Development in the context of the world in general is a complex dialectical interaction of progress and regress. We can speak about the single direction of development only in application to individual systems and processes. In addition, the correlation of progress and regress in different areas of the material world is not uniform. Inorganic nature is dominated by "neutral" processes, although there are both progressive and regressive changes. As for living nature, the main trend here consists in progressive changes: internal organization, structure and functions of living organisms grow more complex, the forms of reflection of the environment by living organisms improve, etc. But here progress under certain conditions gives way to regressive change. Society as a whole, for instance, makes progress although, as has been pointed out above, not along a direct line; there have been quite a few setbacks in history, such as the installation of fascist regimes in individual countries. Societies in which counter-revolutionary elements have won temporary victories also retrace their development. But in general, as Engels noted, "all successive historical systems are only transitory stages in the endless course of development of human society from the lower to the higher".[1]

It is necessary to study the laws of the dialectics of the objective world so as to understand its nature better.

## 2. Basic Laws of the Development of the World

As has been noted above, all phenomena and processes in the world are interrelated. Interrelationship is a basic, universal and essential property of matter. Relationships are permanent and temporary, stable and unstable, recurrent and non-recurrent, necessary and accidental, essential and inessential. Those relationships which are essential, necessary, stable and recurrent constitute *laws*.

Here is one example. If you drop a stone, it will necessarily fall to Earth. However many times we drop that stone, it will repeatedly fall down. So we have here a phenomenon which is not accidental but which *necessarily takes place and cannot fail to occur.* Any object without support is drawn to the Earth under the effect of gravitation. The fall of objects is not merely an objective, recurrent and permanent process but a process which takes place as a necessity which cannot be averted. Therefore, we may draw the conclusion that *the law is an objective, essential, necessary, stable and recurrent relationship of phenomena or their aspects, properties and*

---

[1] Frederick Engels, "Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy", in: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1973, p. 339.

*components.*

The numerous relationships of reality make themselves manifest in diverse laws. Laws may be *special, general* and *universal. Special* laws are essential connections between individual, narrow areas and aspects of reality. One such connection is the law that electric current stands in direct proportion to tension and in reverse proportion to circuit resistance. *General* laws are those whose effect applies to the whole of nature, to all social phenomena or to human thinking as a whole. These are, for instance, the law of gravitation, the law of the conservation and transformation of energy and of matter, etc. *Universal* laws hold true for all phenomena in nature, society and thought. They include the law of the relationship between the material and the ideal, laws of development and laws of universal relationships, or, as they are often referred to, laws of dialectics. The laws of dialectics are subdivided into *basic* and *non-basic.* Basic laws reflect processes of development, and non-basic laws manifest the more general relationships of objects and phenomena, the degree of development and manifestation of processes, their structure and composition. There is a dialectical interrelationship between basic and non-basic, general and special laws.

There are *three basic laws* of dialectics.

1. The law of the unity and struggle of opposites, which demonstrates the source of development.
2. The law of the mutual transformation of quantitative and qualitative changes, which demonstrates the mechanism of development.
3. The law of the negation of negation, which conveys the direction of development.

Let us analyze the nature and content of these laws.

## The Law of the Unity and Struggle of Opposites

The point of the law of the unity and struggle of opposites is that every object, process, and phenomenon is characterised by the *interconnection and struggle* of its opposite sides, which gives it an internal impetus to develop. *The law of the unity and struggle of opposites is a constant relationship and struggle of opposites in objects, processes and phenomena.*

Opposites are different, conflicting components, aspects, properties and tendencies within the bounds of an integral material or spiritual entity. For instance, the poles of the magnet presuppose the existence of each other and at the same time are mutually exclusive. The exploiting class cannot exist without the exploited, while the exploited are found only where the exploiters' rule has not been overthrown, i.e., where the exploiters are in existence.

The interaction of opposites represents a *contradiction.* Contradiction is a complex phenomenon because it incorporates mutual recognition of existence and mutual exclusion, and also an intertwining of unity and struggle. The importance of these aspects of contradiction, moreover, is not equivalent. Lenin pointed out that "the unity (coincidence, identity, equal action) of opposites is conditional, temporary, transitory, relative. The struggle of mutually exclusive opposites is absolute, just as development and motion are absolute."[1]

Counteraction, mutual exclusion and struggle have the main role to play in contradiction as compared with unity because they alone resolve contradiction and ensure further development.

The interests of classes in antagonistic societies are hostile, mutually exclusive and irreconcilable. Hence an objective need to resolve the contradiction betwen them. It is the contradiction between the exploiters and the exploited that is the source of revolutionary upheavals and a revolutionary transition to a society without exploitation of man by man. Contradictions between the oppressed nations of the colonies and the colonisers were one of the reasons and sources of the revolutionary-liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The resolution of these contradictions under proper conditions led to the disintegration of the colonial system and the emergence of a large group of developing countries which are building societies without exploitation.

It is important to distinguish between *internal* and *external* contradictions.

*Internal contradictions* are those which arise between the opposite tendencies *within* an object, contradictions which are intrinsic to objects, processes or phenomena.

*External contradictions* are contradictions *between* objects, processes, phenomena or systems.

Class struggle between feudal landowners and serfs is a manifestation of internal contradictions within feudal society. Contradictions between developing and capitalist countries as a consequence of the latter trying to impose on the emergent states neocolonialist conditions of coexistence are external. Internal contradictions play the leading role in the development of the real world because they constitute the source of the self-motion and self-development of the world. External contradictions, however, also exert substantial influence on the course of events and on the development of one system or another: contradictions between the forces of revolution and the imperialists, for example, undoubtedly hamper revolutionary changes in these countries.

Internal and external contradictions should not be regarded in isolation from each other. One and the same contradiction may be either internal or external, depending on the context.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "On the Question of Dialectics", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 358.

For instance, contradictions between capitalist countries stemming from their struggle for zones of influence and markets are external with regard to each of those countries. At the same time these contradictions are internal when we consider the system of capitalist countries as a whole, as an antipode of the socialist system.

It is also important to distinguish between *basic* and *non-basic, principal* and *secondary* contradictions both in analyzing the processes of development and in practice.

Basic contradictions are those which play the leading role in the development of a given phenomenon and determine the general direction of its development. The basic contradiction of capitalist society is the contradiction between the social character of production and the private form of appropriation. The basic contradiction of our age is that between socialism and capitalism because it determines the character and direction of social development as a whole and the condition of international relations and all the other relations between states and classes throughout the world.

For example, the victories of national liberation revolutions and the disintegration of the colonial system became possible because the forces of socialism had inflicted a crushing defeat on the forces of imperialism in World War II and aggravated the crisis of world imperialism, which had been caused by the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia in 1917. Of course, contradictions between the colonial nations and the colonizers also contributed to this change.

Progress in resolving the basic contradiction of our age in favour of socialism became the main source of the collapse of the colonial system and provided conditions for the effective resolution of contradictions between the oppressed nations and the colonizers.

Non-basic contradictions are all the rest of the contradictions which operate along with basic ones. These include today, for instance, certain contradictions arising between individual developing countries. They can usually be resolved by peaceful means, through negotiations.

There also are *principal* and *secondary* contradictions. While basic contradictions determine the development of a phenomenon at *all* the stages of its existence, principal contradictions do that only at one stage or another.

While the basic contradiction of today's Afghan society is the contradiction between the backwardness of the country, inherited from previous regimes, and the need for its economic, social and cultural progress, the principal contradiction, which is effective temporarily, at a certain stage of the development of Afghan society, is the contradiction between the revolutionary and the counter-revolutionary forces.

The ability to discern the principal contradiction in objects and phenomena helps to determine priorities and to tackle all problems in their entirety.

The manifestation, relationship and correlation of different contradictions depend on the degree of organisation of matter. For this reason the effect of the law of the unity and struggle of opposites manifests itself in specific ways in the different forms of motion of matter. The unity and struggle of opposites as such is manifest particularly clearly only in social life. In organic nature this unity and struggle have a different character. For instance, changeability and heredity, their unity and "struggle" can hardly be discussed in the same terms as the effects of this law in social life. Interconnection and "struggle" in inorganic nature are even more specific. Motion and immobility, stability and destruction, for instance, relate to each other in a different way in inorganic nature than in organic or socially-organized material systems.

The higher the level to which matter rises as it develops from inorganic nature to society, the more complex and multifaceted the process of development becomes. Struggle between the old and the new grows more acute and contradictions make themselves felt sharper. In this way the contradiction depends on the system in which the opposites interact. Different contradictions operate in different social systems. There is a distinction first and foremost between *antagonistic* and *non-antagonistic* contradictions. Antagonistic contradictions are those between social groups and classes whose basic interests are absolutely divergent and will never be reconciled. For instance, the vital economic interests of the exploiter classes are directly opposite to the interests of the working classes. That is why there is an irreconcilable contradiction between these classes. Hence the constant struggle of the working classes for their liberation, eventually erupting into revolution and bringing about the establishment of new relations in society. Conversely, when the vital interests of classes and groups coincide in the main issues, non-antagonistic contradictions come to the fore. In socialist countries, for instance, there still are differences in the situation of the class of workers and that of peasants at certain stages of development. There are contradictions between them; but they are non-antagonistic because the interests of workers and peasants mainly coincide: they are all interested in augmenting social wealth because their living standards depend on this in equal measure. That is why there is no class struggle between them.

From what has been said above about the law of the unity and struggle of opposites, the following general conclusion can be drawn: this law is fundamental to the process of development and actually constitutes the source of development. Awareness of this law and reckoning with its requirements in practical activity enable people to explain and transform phenomena on a scientific basis. To be aware of this law and reckon with it means that in analyzing real phenomena it is necessary to bear in mind their controversial character, and the fact that they have opposite aspects, properties and tendencies which are constantly at war, and to consider them always in motion and development. It is particularly important to distinguish between contradictions, internal and external, to identify the basic contradiction, which determines the course of development and specific characteristics of phenomena, to single out outstanding principal contradictions and to know ways of resolving them.

## The Law of the Mutual Transformation of Quantitative and Qualitative Changes

As has been noted above, the law of the transformation of quantitative into qualitative changes constitutes the mechanism of development, of transition from the old to the new, and determines the process of the emergence of the new in the course of development.

It is necessary above all to understand what is meant by *quantity* and by *quality*, and to consider their relationships, interaction and the specific features of these relationships and interaction in different systems.

Let us begin with quality. Every object possesses many properties with one of them standing forth as its *principal* property, representing the "face" of the given object, so to speak, by which we distinguish it from among others. The principal property of metal, say, is the presence in it of a certain number of specifically organized atoms (*Fe*), weight, malleability, electrical conductivity, etc. The distinguishing properties of man are his physiological and social characteristics.

*The totality of the specific features, characteristics and properties, connected with the viability and stability of a given object or thing, constitute their quality.*

The quality of an object or thing should be distinguished from its secondary qualities representing inconsequent characteristics and aspects of these objects (say, good food or poor food, which represents not the inner essence, of this food but its ingredients, quality of cooking, consequences of storage, etc.). A given object does not cease to exist as precisely this object even if it sheds its secondary qualities. That is why quality is a unity of components and structure thanks to which a given object exists in its own form.

Objects and phenomena are characterized not only in qualitative, but also in quantitative terms.

Quantitative characteristics may be *extensive* and *intensive*. The former include size, volume, number, etc. They are indifferent to a certain extent with regard to the essence of an object. The latter represents the rate, degree and level of its development. Changes in intensive characteristics directly cause the restructuring of objects and changes in their qualities. However, extensive characteristics have to change for this to happen. This means that extensive and intensive changes are closely interrelated. For instance, it takes materials which are not found in nature to build a plane or a missile. Where can you take, for example, an alloy which would be harder than steel and more transparent than glass? The problem has been resolved through developing synthetic polymers, i.e. substances whose molecules consist of a great number of atoms. It has turned out that with the change of the number of atoms and the structure of molecules all the properties of substance drastically change as well. What has been hard becomes flexible, and what has been opaque becomes transparent. Changing the quantitative composition of molecules, scientists can obtain new qualities, new properties in substances. Moreover, changes in quality proceed at different speeds depending on the quantitative composition of chemical elements and reagents.

All this shows that *quantity is a definite state of objects and phenomena which characterizes their magnitude or size, number, volume and the rate and degree of their development.*

What has been said above also prompts another conclusion: quantity and quality are interrelated and depend on each other, they are in unity and interaction. At the same time quantity and quality are different, opposite characteristics of a thing which cannot be represented through each other and which are contradictory. This contradiction grows more acute and demands solution, which is achieved through the formation of a new quality and the emergence of new quantitative characteristics. The contradiction grows sharper because of the change of quantitative characteristics, which prepare the ground for and at a certain moment trigger off qualitative changes.

But how and when is the old qualitative state replaced by the new under the influence of quantitative changes? The fact is that the transformation of quantitative changes into fundamental qualitative ones occurs not with any change in quantity but only when this quantity reaches a certain limit, within the bounds of a *certain measure.*

*Measure is the controversial unity of the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of an object.* It is a boundary, as it were, within which a given quality is preserved. It shows that a certain qualitative state has strictly defined quantitative limits. Changes in quantity within these limits do not cause qualitative transformations. But when quantity changes beyond these limits, there is a change in quality because of alterations in the structure of a substance, body or system. Quantity changes into quality through a "*leap*".

*A leap is a radical transformation and the most intensive form of development.* Leaps are distinguished by direction of development, and in this case they may be progressive and regressive. They also differ in duration: there are fast leaps and leaps which occur through the gradual accretion of elements of a new quality, proceeding relatively slowly and resulting in gradual changes in quality. Leaps of the former type are illustrated by nuclear reactions, which begin suddenly and have the form of an explosion which occurs as soon as the quantity of uranium and other components reaches a certain level. It is this property of radioactive substances that is used in the atomic bomb and other nuclear weapons.

Leaps of the other type, those which proceed slowly, are exemplified by the evolution of the animal and plant world. The emergence of qualitatively new species of plants and animals (including man) had to do with leaps which lasted millions of years.

Philosophers have been arguing what type of leaps prevails in developing systems and objects and how different types of leaps are related to each other because there exist diverse forms of leaps in the objective world. In particular, the questions of relationship between a leap and revolution and between revolution and evolution in social development are very important. *Revolution* is a leap, a break in continuity, a fundamental qualitative change. At the same time not every leap is revolution. First, revolution is a leap on a large scale, affecting all the subsequent development of society. It can be a socio-political, scientific and technological or cultural revolution, etc. Second, revolution is a progressive leap, a leap forward. For instance, what took place in Afghanistan in April 1978 was a genuine progressive socio-political revolution which, along with fundamentally changing the socio-economic conditions of life in society, gave rise to a number of other revolutionary reforms in culture, education, etc. At the same time the drastic change of socio-political relations as a consequence of the seizure of power by fascist elements cannot be considered revolution even if they insist that it is. As a rule, such events are counter-revolutions, particularly if they take place in countries which have previously been the scene of genuine revolutionary changes. Anyway, they are but regressive leaps, which slow down social development.

As for the relationship between evolution and revolution, they are forms of quantitative and qualitative changes through which development takes place. In this sense *quantitative changes* can be called evolutionary. Evolution is smooth, gradual and slow development without dramatic leaps or transition into a new quality. *But development involving the drastic break down of the old and the qualitative overhaul of social relations*, scientific concepts, technology, etc. is revolutionary. In this way development in the objective world is the unity of evolutionary and revolutionary forms. Dialectical materialism therefore does not reject the idea of evolution. Lenin made use of the concept "evolution" on more than one occasion, discussing, for instance, "economic evolution".[1] But he strongly opposed the misrepresentation of the essence of evolutionary processes in the real world by metaphysicians, all sorts of reformists and opportunists, who put evolutionary change above everything else in development and try to picture development as a purely evolutionary process having no room for leaps and hence revolutions. These interpretations of development in social life give rise to *reformism*, which is characterized by rejection of the revolutionary struggle of the mass of the people and by attempts to substitute half-hearted reforms, which do not affect the foundations of the exploiter system, for the struggle of the working classes.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 325.

Dialectical materialism is opposed to this one-sided approach not only because it clashes with truth but also because the working people have never achieved genuine freedom and salvation from exploitation in any exploiter society with the help of reforms alone. At best, they only achieved temporary relief, temporary victory, and even then only if that suited the exploiters, who made concessions as tactical ploys to deceive the working people and public opinion.

Exposing reformism, scientific philosophy does not reject reforms, but approves those reforms which have revolutionary significance.

For instance, the land reforms carried out in many emergent countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia, including Ethiopia, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and Afghanistan, are a progressive phenomenon because they gradually erode the foundations of exploitation of man by man. These reforms are viewed as a form of preparation for, or as the foundation of, further revolutionary change. For this reason Communists oppose "left-wing" revisionists, anarchists and various extremist groupings who reject evolutionary processes, ignore preparatory, educational and organisational work but pin their hopes on great leaps, overthrows and decisive events. The dialectics of social development, however, shows that dramatic changes in the life of society are impossible without revolutionary leaps, while revolutions themselves cannot win without proper conditions and preparatory work. Disregard for this circumstance results in adventurism and abortive revolutions.

It is a different matter that the transformation of quantitative changes into qualitative and the character of relationship between slow evolutionary changes and revolutionary ones depend on specific conditions of development, phenomena and processes and on the contradictions which are resolved during a leap. For instance, the specific characteristics of all these factors in Afghan society today determines the peculiarity of qualitative changes in its development. Transition to new forms of social relations and the building of society without exploitation and enslavement are taking place in developing countries both through slow evolutionary changes with due regard for the preceding stages of development, and through revolutionary changes which occur on the basis of the conditions created in the course of evolution.

For instance, transition to a qualitatively new mode of production which is connected with the development of the public sector in the economy is effected as proper material and spiritual conditions are prepared and mature. Under the circumstances, the private sector, far from being abolished, keeps growing, and foreign investment in it is allowed. The progressive parties and governments of developing countries, guided by scientific sociology, justly point out that a country must not leap over essential stages of development, just as it must not artificially halt its progress. This approach to the tasks set by revolutions in those countries will undoubtedly contribute to progress in the liberated countries. The correctness of this approach to evolution and revolution is borne out by the experience gained in socialist revolutions and the building of socialism in the USSR and other socialist countries, and also by that of the national liberation movements in many countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Hence (and *it is the point of the law of the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative and vice versa), gradual quantitative changes, having exceeded the measure of an object, cause fundamental qualitative changes occurring in the form of a leap.* The new quality of an object is characterized by new quantitative characteristics and sets a new measure for their changes. This relationship of quantitative and qualitative changes has a universal character and is found in nature, society and thought alike. The law of the transition of quantitative changes into fundamental qualitative ones, therefore, is both objective and universal; it will never be abrogated anywhere by anyone. And this being the case, development cannot be free from the influence of that law, i.e. development without leaps, revolutionary upheavals prepared by real processes under the influence of objective causes, cannot be imagined. The effect of this and other objective laws cannot be disregarded in scientific concepts either. Every concept, claiming to be scientific, objective and impartial, should recognise that development proceeds by leaps and that revolutionary processes are legitimate. That is why dialectical materialism takes issue with the conclusions of metaphysical philosophy which denies the revolutionary character of development and recognizes evolutionary change to the exclusion of everything else. That is why the conclusions of dialectical materialism about the inevitable fall of exploiting societies, torn apart by irreconcilable contradictions, cannot be disputed. When imperialists and reactionaries of every type try to explain away the causes of national liberation, people's democratic and other revolutions by the "intrigues of Moscow and world communism", their allegations are obvious slander designed for those who do not know scientific theory.

What is taking place in Nicaragua and El Salvador, in Namibia and

Mozambique, Angola and Ethiopia, Kampuchea and Laos, and many other countries represents different forms and stages of the resolution of objective contradictions which have ripened there, the transformation of quantitative changes, which have reached their limit, into new qualitative states.

## The Law of the Negation of Negation

The conclusion of dialectical materialism that insignificant quantitative changes bring about at a certain stage and under certain conditions not merely a new quality but *a higher quality* are based on real facts, on the effect of the *law of the negation of negation.*

What is this law about?

We have found out that there is nothing eternal in the world. Having appeared, any phenomenon or organism grows, develops, gains strength but then grows old, runs its course and perishes. This happens to every plant, animal or human being. Even what seems eternal and immutable goes through these stages and meets its end.

This means that a constant process of rennovation, with old phenomena disappearing and new ones emerging, is taking place in the world.

*The substitution of the new for the old means the negation of the latter.* But what happens to the new? It also runs its natural course, develops only to grow old and give way to new phenomena and forces. While previously it negated the old now it is negated itself by something new, which is younger and stronger. A seed which gets into soil gives out shoots and thus dies. It is negated by shoot springing from it.

The shoot grows, develops, and at a certain stage withers; it is negated by new seeds. What we have here is double negation, *the negation of negation.* Since the process of emergence and destruction has neither beginning nor end, the process of the negation of negation is a continuous and endless process. But what are the results of this process? Let us analyze *types* of negation to get an idea of these results. Not every negation is related to development. If negation takes place outside the system in which a contradiction is being resolved, this negation results merely in destruction. Reality supplies many instances of such negation. If grain is ground into flour, the seeds will never again give out shoots or yield a new harvest. If a camel crushes a bug, it will disappear and the next stage in its development will never set in: its life will come to an end altogether, substituted by physical and chemical processes of non-living nature. Such negations, negations which involve destruction, occur in social life as well. The military coup in Chile is an example of such negation. This negation can be called a nihilistic, absolute negation or, as Lenin called it, "empty negation", "futile negation".[1]

But there is another kind of negation, which occurs in the process of the struggle of opposites within the bounds of the unity of a system. As a consequence, only what does not correspond to new conditions and is not adapted to the changing situation perishes in this conflict. Everything which is in accord with the changed conditions, everything positive and valuable which is contained in the old survives and continues, coexisting with the victorious new, becomes involved in the new stage and, moreover, provides the foundation for the new. In other words, negation within the bounds of the unity and struggle of opposites means both destruction of the old and emergence of the new, the opposite of the old, in its place and on its basis. This negation is found in the dialectical process of the objective world, i.e. in the process characterized by the unity and struggle of opposites, by the transition of quantitative changes into fundamental qualitative ones, and by the negation of negation. In philosophy this negation is known as *dialectical negation.* Dialectical negation, being a component of development, is at the same time the basis of continuity and one of the aspects of the relationship between the present and the past, thanks to which the history of both nature and human society exists.

But continuity is not so much a relationship between the present and the past as a continuous process of selecting the best and most valuable of the past, which is dying away, and of developing on this basis the present; it is a transition from the lower to the higher. Indeed, if the new, emergent as a result of victory over the old, retains everything the best of that old and preserves achievements of early stages, and also contains only what meets the changed conditions in the best possible way, this new has a higher quality and signifies ascent to a higher level of development. Furthermore, if the first negation means the transition of a phenomenon into its opposite and if a series of negations occur in the course of development, repeated negation—the negation of negation—brings about the restoration and repetition of the properties of the initial stage. But this repetition is incomplete and relative because the transition into the opposite is not ultimate. At the same time it does not mean a complete return to the old but only looks like reversal. In actual fact every negation is a transition to a higher level and, being a "reverse motion", leads to a higher point, which means that motion takes place not in a circle but in a *spiral*. That was why Lenin noted in one of his works that an outcome of the negation of negation is the *apparent* return to the old but that it is the return to the old only in form but not in fact because the process has been enriched and raised to a higher level.[1]

---

[1] See V. I. Lenin, "Conspectus of Hegel's Book *The Science of Logic*", *Collected Works,* Vol. 38, p. 225.

The above illustration with grain at first sight shows that what we have here is a closed circle: we began with seeds and got seeds as a result of the course of development. Indeed there is repetition here, though it is not mere repetition, of course, but repetition at a new, higher level. First, we have got not one but several seeds as a result. Second, new seeds differ from their progenitor in certain ways. While the stalk was growing, it was exposed to the effects of the environment and conveyed all information about these effects to its fruit, new seeds. For this reason new seeds are better adapted to the changed conditions and therefore have a higher quality with regard to their environment. If there has been no development in nature, the organisms would have continued unchanged through millions and millions of years. In reality, as we know, they have travelled a long path of development from primordial elementary organisms to higher mammals and, eventually, man.

This law also manifests itself in social development. Society has passed through a number of stages, beginning with primitive society, each of them being a higher stage than the previous one; socialism is the first phase of the most perfect type of society, communism. Stage-by-stage social development does not mean, however, that all people, who constituted old society, disappear as a species, or all technology created by that society, or the entire knowledge characteristic of a given stage of social development. If all this did disappear, society would not have reached a new stage of development. This stage calls for the development of labor implements, technology and man, for the destruction of social relations which have outlived themselves, for the utilisation of production and technical achievements of the preceding stage and also for scientific knowledge, and for the development of qualitatively new social relations, a new state and new ideology contributing to the more effective development of man, science and technology.

This progress is likewise obvious in the centuries-old development of our knowledge, which vastly exceeds the knowledge of our primitive forefathers in depth, scope and rate of growth.

Progress from the lower forms to the higher, as we see, is manifest in different areas and has a universal character.

All this prompts the conclusion that *the essence of the law of the negation of negation consists in the constant dialectical negation of the old by the new, in the constant spiral-like ascent from the old to the new, and in the repetition of the old at a new and higher level.*

The law of the negation of negation, as all the other universal laws of dialectics, always manifests itself in specific forms depending on the conditions of development and on the characteristics of the phenomena which develop. These specific forms are observed not only in such different areas as animate and inanimate nature and society, but also in every particular phenomenon. It is therefore clear why negations differ depending on the type of society. In exploiting societies, where old social relations, the old exploiter state, old ideology and so on no longer meet the needs of the new level of development of the productive forces, negation is more drastic. As the transition to a new, socialist stage of development takes place, little of the old is preserved. Such components of old society as production (economic) relations, the state (political organization), the law and ideology cannot be used by the new type of society and therefore are destroyed and discarded. Nothing of the counter-revolutionary organizations can be "preserved" either, so they are eliminated. This is not done, of course, out of blind revenge or "a thirst for destruction" but to provide room for genuine development. At the same time everything valuable and progressive that was found in the old society is carefully preserved.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 222.

It would be senseless to ignore, for instance, advanced technology, experience in organizing production, skilled personnel, science, the best achievements of national culture, old customs and traditions which do not hamper development, etc. That is why the revolutions in a number of countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, while wiping out exploiter states and the system of social relations rooted in exploitation, at the same time show concern for national cultures and tradition and gather, cherish and replenish all the best of what has been produced by earlier stages of social development.

The enemies of progress slanderously claim that old culture, customs and mores will be lost with the building of new society, society without exploitation, guiding itself by progressive ideology.

The practice of people's democratic and socialist revolutions in many countries has demonstrated that only that gets lost what people themselves discard under new conditions of life. For instance, if they no longer need to give away their small daughters to the employ of rich merchants to repay their debts or to get a little food and money to support their families, society will not lose anything and will only benefit. If new society does away with the conditions under which the rich pass by beggar children, the sick and the elderly, the people at large will not lose anything either. If compulsory education for all is introduced in a new society, culture will under no circumstances be adversely affected. So the calls of reactionaries for preserving old culture beguile their desire to preserve old undemocratic rights and privileges.

Negation is found in socialist society as well. But since contradictions in that society are not antagonistic, negations in it are not antagonistic either. They do not and cannot take the form of socio-political revolutions. Large-scale negations proceed gradually, are carried out consciously, in a balanced way and according to plan, and continuity is present to a larger degree. Generally speaking, an entirely new type of social progress is taking shape in socialist society.

## 3. Universal Relationships in the Objective World Non-Basic Laws of Dialectics

It takes the knowledge not only of the laws of development but also of the laws of universal interrelation to understand the dialectical character of the surrounding world.

While examining the more general laws of development, we already noted that development itself proceeds through the interrelation and interaction of phenomena. However, we concentrated attention only on those relationships which exist between opposites, through which contradictions emerge and unfold as a source of development. Meanwhile, these do not exhaust the diversity of relationships in reality. The dialectics of the objective world cannot be reduced to the laws of development alone. Relationships of phenomena are universal. Moreover, the universal character of these relationships means not only that every phenomenon is necessarily related to another but also that these relationships are multifaceted and operate simultaneously in different directions, accounting for the fabric of phenomena and reflecting the degree of their development. These relationships are expressed in the operation of what is known as non-basic laws of dialectics.

*Non-basic laws of dialectics are those universal laws which reflect the more general interrelation and interaction of individual essential properties and aspects of objects and phenomena, the degree of their development, manifestation, their structure and composition.*

Since these relationships are very diverse, they are expressed in a large number of laws. In particular, these (non-basic) laws include essential, stable, recurrent and intrinsic relationships between:

1. The individual, the particular and the universal;
2. Phenomenon and essence;
3. Form and content;
4. Cause and effect;
5. Necessity and chance;
6. Possibility and reality, etc.

Let us consider each of these laws.

### The Individual, the Particular and the Universal

Essential, stable, objective interrelation between individual and universal properties in objects, processes and phenomena expresses the essence of the *law of unity between the individual and the universal.*

The individual consists in singular, unique features and properties of an object, process or phenomenon.

The universal consists in substantially similar, identical, recurrent features and properties found in all the individual phenomena of a certain group.

The individual and the universal constitute aspects, components of the individual. Every individual thing is, in one way or another, universal. Anything universal is a component (aspect) of the individual. The Saur Revolution in Afghanistan is an individual event with its characteristic features and aspects which distinguish it from any other revolution. A totality of its other features, such as the vesting of power in representatives of the people, abolition of the exploitation of man by man, introduction of equal rights to health care and education, etc., which are characteristic of many other revolutions, constitutes the universal.

The individual and the universal should not be mistaken for the singular and the mass. Anything new emerges as the singular and then becomes the mass, the numerous. For instance, socialism initially emerged in one country, the Soviet Union. Subsequently the number of socialist countries grew. But what is universal for socialism is not the total number of socialist countries, nor even their common objects but a totality of properties which are necessarily found in the socialist system and which distinguish it from other systems of society. These include the dictatorship of the proletariat, public ownership of the means of production, etc. In other words, the universal is that, which is characteristic of a group of related objects or phenomena, or a class of objects and phenomena.

There are different forms of the universal. For instance, Mohammed Gol is a Pushtu.Mohammed Gol is the individual and Pushtu is the universal. But Mohammed Gol is not only a Pushtu but also an Afghan. That is why such a degree of the universal as "Pushtu" is related to a higher degree of the universal (the Afghan) as the *particular.* The particular is a totality of specific features which are characteristic only of a given class of phenomena, objects and processes and which distinguish them from another class of objects and phenomena. The particular is unbreakably connected with the individual and the universal. The particular constitutes the universal with regard to the individual and as the individual with regard to the universal of a higher degree.

To know all these points is very important for comprehending various processes of reality. For instance, metaphysicians artificially divorce the individual from the universal and the particular from the individual and the universal, and consider each of them in isolation from other phenomena. In this way all kind of revisionists try to break the unity of socialist and socialist-oriented countries by artificially exaggerating specific characteristics of individual countries, "ignoring" the general laws of transition to socialism, and holding forth on absolute "individuality", etc. Dogmatists, conversely, reduce everything to universal patterns and uphold them to the exclusion of specific features of individual countries. Both these deviations are very dangerous because they are opposed to scientific views and to the building of the foundations of new society. Lenin wrote that all nations will eventually arrive at socialism—this is inevitable, but all will do so in ways that are not exactly the same. Each contributing something of its own to some form of democracy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and to the varying rate of socialist transformations in the different aspects of social life.[1] The CPSU follows unswervingly this precept of Lenin, which has now been forcefully corroborated by historical practice. Indeed, the forms, methods and ways of socialist revolution have not been mechanically copied in any of the existing socialist countries.

However, guided by scientific philosophy, the Communists oppose compromises of creative Marxism with sectarian dogmatism and leftist adventurism, and compromises between true revolutionaries and reformists who distort the essence of the problem.

## Cause and Effect

Cause and effect constitute one universal relationship.

*The essence of the law of cause and effect is that all the processes and phenomena in the world have their causes and effects, and that cause is a source of effect while effect is a result of the operation of cause.*

*Cause* is a phenomenon which brings about another phenomenon or some change in it. It would be more correct to consider that phenomena are caused not by an individual factor but by the interaction of forces, bodies, processes or intrinsic components and systems producing effect.

*Effect* is a consequence of the operation of cause. For instance, a low combat readiness of troops is a consequence of inadequate training, that is, inadequate training constitutes one of the major causes of their low combat readiness. Cause precedes effect. However, not everything preceding something can be its cause. For instance, day precedes night and peace precedes war. But day is not the cause of night, nor peace the cause of war. One phenomenon is considered the cause of another only if there is an effective material relationship between them. It is very important to bear this in mind because there exist fallacious concepts of causality. For instance, some idealists claim that history is shaped not by objective factors but by an "ultimate goal", which is beyond man's understanding and is only cognized by the chosen few. The people and the army can only obediently follow these elect. In reality, however, there are no relationships without certain causes. Everything taking place in nature and society has its cause, and these causes are found in the development of matter and in people's material relations.

---

[1] See V. I. Lenin, "A Caricature of Marxism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1964, pp. 69-70.

Since both the development of matter and material relations between people are very complex, cause and effect are also in a complex relationship, which consists in the following:

1. Effect may influence cause. For instance, the cause of the plight of the working people consists in feudal and capitalist social relations rooted in the exploitation of man by man. Social revolutions are usually the effect of exploitation and of the contradiction between the productive forces and relations of production. This effect exerts a decisive influence on the cause of social revolutions; it eliminates relations of exploitation in society and establishes new relations, which are conducive to progress;

2. In certain instances effect may itself become cause. The exit of a shell from the gun is the effect of the shot (i.e. an instantaneous burning of powder). The explosion of this shell (effect) becomes the cause of the defeat of enemy troops;

3. There are different causes, internal and external, main and secondary. Moreover, each of them can become its opposite. For instance, the internal conflict between the class of the working people and the class of exploiters constitutes the intrinsic cause of social revolutions. The internal cause here is also the main cause. At the same time social revolution in some countries is the effect of not only internal but also external causes – the general crisis of capitalism, the influence of the ideas of the October 1917 Revolution in Russia and the disintegration of the colonial system, as was the case in some newly free countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. In this case the former cause is secondary and the latter main;

4. Several causes may often combine to produce one effect. For instance, grave ailments of the heart, lungs, kidneys and other organs, being independent causes, may bring about the same effect, the death of man. At the same time one cause may have several effects. A patient may run a temperature, develop pneumonia, rheumatism and other complications, all because of the same cause, the cold.

Causes should be distinguished from *occasion*. Occasion is a phenomenon accelerating the operation of cause and the emergence of effect. For instance, dismissals of workers from capitalist factories are often the occasion for strikes, whereas the cause here is the exploitation of workers by capitalists. Reactionary forces in their struggle against the forces of progress deliberately make up occasions for their counter-revolutionary attacks. For instance, the military junta in Chile overthrew the ligitimate Allende government under the pretext of restoring the Constitution, allegedly violated by that government. In reality the purpose of the coup was restoration of the capitalist way of life.

The diversity of cause and effect relationships in the objective world results in their diverse manifestations. The characteristics of these relationships examined above constitute what is called mechanical causality. Meanwhile, philosophers have now established that mechanical causality is not universal and that there can exist and do exist other types of causality under different conditions. For instance, there is a special type of causality in the microworld due to the effect of statistic rather than dynamic law-governed processes. Idealists, having failed to detect mechanical causality there, try to deny causality in the world at large. It is clear today, however, that their attempts are groundless.

Knowledge of all the characteristics of relationships and manifestations of cause and effect is very important both to theory and to practice. In particular, a thorough understanding of causality and the ability to identify the main causes enable people to make correct decisions, to preclude the effect of unwelcome causes and promptly to eliminate mistakes.

In view of all this, dialectical materialism upholds the principle of determinism, which asserts, among everything else, the universal and objective character of causality. This philosophy is strongly opposed to subjective idealists, who hold the different point of view, namely, indeterminism which denies the universal and objective nature of causality.

## Necessity and Chance

We already know that there is nothing immutable, immobile or ossified forever in the world, first and foremost because matter has an objective inherent source of development. This means that every process, phenomenon and change in the world takes place *out of necessity*. Moreover, this necessity manifests itself not only in individual processes but also as a cumulative, resultant force. Necessity is what is conditioned by the internal causes and character of processes and what comes inevitably. Necessity expresses a certain succession of events, their law-governed regularity. Human society develops out of necessity (as a natural historical process). The advance of the peoples to freedom, national independence, peace and social progress is necessary and invincible because this process is determined by the actual alignment of the forces struggling to liberate people from oppression, to prevent war and impede the forces opposed to this.

At the same time necessity is not fatality; it depends on conditions and may assume different forms. Changed conditions may alter the manifestation of necessity.

However, more often than not necessity manifests itself in what must take place under certain conditions as a consequence of the operation of the basic laws of dialectics or basic cause-and-effect relationships.

Necessity is at the same time connected with *chance* as its opposite.

*Chance* is what is external, secondary and inessential in a phenomenon, what may happen and may fail to occur, or else may take place in a different way. This does not mean, however, that chance depends on something supernatural, on fate. Chance is an objective phenomenon and, just as any other phenomenon, has its causes. That is why there is no absolute, unconditional chance. Some phenomena can be accidental only with regard to a certain law-governed relationship, whereas in another relationship the same phenomenon constitutes necessity. Science has established that as a rule those processes and phenomena are accidental which have been caused by secondary causes as a consequence of the operation of special circumstances, or a special interaction of the basic and non-basic laws of dialectics. Chance often occurs when two or more necessary chains of connections cross. For instance, it is a chance that the revolution in Afghanistan took place on April 27 (Saur 7), 1978. It could have occurred far earlier or later. But the fact that the revolution was made precisely in Afghanistan, where social contradictions had grown particularly acute by that time, is not chance but a necessary consequence of these contradictions. At the same time the Afghan revolution is the result of the vigorous and purposeful activities of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan. Chance in the above example emerged at the point of contact of two chains of connections, each of them being necessary (the necessity of resolving objective contradictions and a necessary consequence of the activities of a subjective factor, the People's Democratic Party). Analysing facts of reality, Engels came to the conclusion that accident, chance is the complement and form of appearance of necessity.[1] Necessity is not only accompanied and complemented by chance but also manifests itself through it. Communism is the necessary consequence of the entire natural historical process, i.e., the objective process of the development of human society. There occur many chance phenomena on the road to that society, however, such as various coups throwing society back in its development and making it proceed in zigzags. Nevertheless, human society moves through these chance phenomena to the supreme stage of its development. As it progresses, the character of social necessity and chance changes depending on the stage of development which a given society has reached. Necessity is a blind, spontaneous force, paving its way through a host of chance phenomena, in a society based on private property and ruled by anarchy. Historical necessity in a society based on public property is realized through the purposeful activities of people and there is less room for chance: chance phenomena thus lose their accidental character to a considerable extent. For instance, under socialism with its planned economy there are food, industrial and other reserves for crop failures and other natural disasters, which minimizes the harmful effects of these chance phenomena. Thus man is not impotent in the face of these unwelcome accidents but is able to neutralize or offset their disastrous effects. All this means that it is possible to foresee certain chance phenomena and avoid their effects.

---

[1] See "Engels to W. Borgius in Breslau", in: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1973, p. 503.

*So the essence of the law of relationship between necessity and chance is that this relationship is omnipresent, constant, unbreakable and objective and that necessity makes its way through a mass of chance phenomena, while the latter constitute a manifestation of necessity working in the opposite direction.*

Necessity presupposes chance, which occurs by force of necessity. This is how this law manifests itself dialectically.

## Necessity and Freedom

Since necessity reigns supreme all over the objective world, it may seem that man is unable to change anything. Indeed, the demands of laws, of objective necessity "restrict" human actions, "contravene" human will and appear to render senseless any attempt on the part of people to act as they see fit. But is it really so?

Indeed, one can hardly do anything disregarding, for instance, the law of gravitation, which "fetters" man and material objects to Earth. People have been trying for centuries to fly, to break away from the Earth, but on every occasion were prevented from doing so by the effect of that law. But it was this way only until they understood the essence of the law. It turned out that, although that law could not be "circumvented", it could nevertheless be "harnessed" by man with the help of other laws, the laws of dynamics and thermodynamics. As a consequence people built planes, began to fly in the atmosphere and even learned to send spacecraft to other planets and bring them back. They did all this on the basis of the law of gravitation.

It follows from this example that people gain freedom not by trying to "shake off" necessity or circumvent it, or oppose it, but when they understand that necessity, which has the force of law, and learn to use the requirements of laws, of natural necessity, for their own purposes.

Engels expressed this idea in the following way: "Freedom does not consist in the dream of independence from natural laws, but in the knowledge of these laws, and in the possibility this gives of systematically making them work towards definite ends."[1] Lenin added: "Necessity is blind only insofar as it is not understood." But if necessity, the law, is understood and if man puts its effect to the service of his interests, he becomes the master of nature.[2]

And, indeed, this is the case.

Before dialectical materialism emerged as a science, people had no idea of the laws governing social development and for this reason remained enslaved by historical necessity. Marxism explained these laws, and it was the first step towards the working people using them to become the true masters and makers of their destinies.

Under socialism people guide themselves by the requirements of these laws and use them in practice to build a new society, and this possibility becomes reality.

Conversely, ignorance of the laws of social development and fear of the forces of nature, let alone "supernatural" forces, do not make people free. Of course, it is necessary to get rid of the exploiters to gain true freedom. But even in this case ignorance of scientific, Marxist-Leninist sociology will hamper social development considerably.

Bourgeois propaganda tries to convince people that only bourgeois society can give them unrestricted freedom. But this bourgeois freedom is like the weather vane, which, although revolving in every direction, is nevertheless a plaything of the winds. If a capitalist decides to close down a factory operating at a loss, the "free" man becomes free from work and gains the freedom to starve to death. The compass needle is another matter: it always points in the same direction, and does not depend on the vagaries of weather. That is why people always find the correct road with its Marxism-Leninism as precisely such compass needle.

Free human activity therefore is not when people do not reckon with laws and objective processes or do as they wish. They only gain true freedom when they cognize the laws of nature, society and thinking, and use them masterfully and responsibly in practical activities. Hence the need for energetic human activity and the task of raising the social activity and responsibility of all members of society.

## Form and Content

Every phenomenon or thing has a certain content and is manifested in a certain form. *Content* is the totality of the components, processes and properties of a thing, or in other words, what it consists of. *Form* is the internal and outward structure of an object or phenomenon, its composition, the way in which its content exists and a certain organisation of its elements and processes in time and space.

---

[1] Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, p. 136.

[2] See V. I. Lenin, "Conspectus of Hegel's Book *The Science of Logic*", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 158.

For instance, the content of an empty glass vessel is the chemical elements of which glass is made. Form is the way in which these elements are bound together and organised. If this vessel is "unfolded" into a sheet of glass, neither its form nor its content will change. If the vessel is filled, for instance, with wine, we will have two forms and two types of content.

*The essence of the law of relationship between content and form is that every process or object is characterised by form and content and that form and content do not exist without each other.*

Let us take a building site with all the components of a house, all its "content", lying about. Can we say that we have a house in front of us? Of course, not. To have a house, it is necessary to put all the components together so that a proper form will take shape.

Neither can there be the form of a house without walls, windows, doors, etc., which means that there can be no form without content. At the same time the dominant component of the unity of form and content is the latter because it takes shape thus creating form for itself, while form only expresses content.

The form of democracy in one country or another is determined by the class content of government. If power belongs to the exploiter classes, democracy is bound to be curtailed. The benefits of democracy are enjoyed for the most part by the dominant class and social strata siding with it. In such cases, democracy is basically false and hypocritical. The actual participation of citizens in government, their equality in law, political rights and freedoms are actually non-existent.

If power belongs to the working classes, another form of democracy, proletarian, socialist democracy, emerges. In this case all the strata of the working people that were formerly oppressed and kept away from political government become actively involved in the administration of state affairs and in political and economic activity. Original social processes in the developing countries have given rise to a new form of democracy, people's democracy, and to democratic republics, which are characterized by cooperation between the proletariat and its party, on the one hand, and non-proletarian, petty-bourgeois parties and political groupings, on the other. The form of this kind of government is a democratic republic which is restructuring on a progressive and democratic basis the state machinery it has inherited from the feudal and tribal, or bourgeois and compradore regime in order to make it serve the working people.

However, while being dependent on content, form is an active aspect of a phenomenon or process and therefore itself affects content. This effect can be dual. Form facilitates the development of content if it corresponds to it. The new form of government in the liberated countries undoubtedly contributes to a more rapid growth of all economic and social relations in these countries. On the other hand, form hampers development if it is obsolescent and does not correspond to content. The old regimes connected with the imperialist forces were the main brake on the development of the emergent countries. The old form has to be replaced by a new one to overcome stagnation and ensure further development. This is precisely what is taking place in those countries where democratic or proletarian revolutions have taken place.

The relative independence of form is also manifest in the fact that old content may assume new form or that old form can hold new content. This situation is exemplified, in particular, by the present state of social relations in certain newly free countries. The new form of government incorporates elements of old content, survivals of old forms of relations between classes. At the same time new content, a new political alliance of different classes, strata and groups is developing not only in a new form, say, new statehood, but also side by side with components of the old state machinery in this new state.

The leading aspect in this relationship is nevertheless content. It is not form that is important in itself but the content held by it. The main aspect of the policy of any form of government is the extent to which this policy represents the interests of the people. That is why the importance of form should not be exaggerated. Formalism in the work of officials, isolation of form from content, exaggeration of the role played by form in development and underestimation of the significance of content are at odds with science and harm development.

The dialectics of form and content, particularly in social life, is very specific. Form and content are antagonistic in exploiting societies. The forms of government in them never make enough room for the development of content. On the contrary, in socialist society contradictions between form and content are non-antagonistic.

## Essence and Phenomenon

An analysis of actual processes and objects shows that all of them have two aspects, the *internal* and the *external.*

The internal aspect of objects and processes, which is relatively stable and definitive, and which is hidden from immediate perception, is their *essence.* Essence expresses the inner relationship of the objective world, and constitutes the basis of the entire diversity of phenomena. Essence is the main element of content because it determines content as something endemic, i.e. constitutes the nature of a thing or process.

The essence of our age is transition from capitalism to socialism, the struggle between the two systems, capitalism and socialism, and the national liberation struggle of the peoples against imperialism and colonialism. The essence of capitalism consists in the social character of production and the private, capitalist form of ownership, and in the exploitation of man by man.

*Phenomenon* (or appearance) is a manifestation of essence, the external form of its existence. Phenomenon is what can be easily perceived with the help of the senses. While essence is relatively stable, phenomenon is volatile. It can be a chance, secondary feature. For this reason essence may manifest itself not in one but in several phenomena. For instance, the essence of capitalism is manifest in the anarchy of production, crises, unemployment, wars, etc.

At the same time essence and phenomenon (appearance) are closely interrelated. A change of the essence is bound to change the phenomenon. *The law of relationship of essence and phenomenon consists in that the essence of objects and processes manifests itself in phenomena, while phenomena reflect essence.* Lenin formulated this idea as follows: "...the essence appears. The appearance is essential."[1]

At the same time the unity of essence and phenomenon should not be understood as their coincidence. If the outward appearance and the essence of things directly coincided, all science would, as Marx observe, be superfluous.[2] Everything would then lie on the surface and would be no deception, people would not be deluded and many of the tragedies that occur because of man's errors and miscalculations could be avoided. Regrettably, this is not go. It takes thorough analysis, ability, experience and knowledge to understand the essence because phenomenon, that is, the outward appearance of events, far from coinciding with the essence, distorts it. It seems, for instance, that the Sun revolves around the immobile Earth. But this appearance is just the reverse of the essence: we know now that the Earth revolves around the Sun. The situation is the same in the life of society. It appears that the working class under capitalism is a free and equal owner of a commodity. It seems that the worker and the capitalist strike a usual deal, with the worker selling his labour and the capitalist paying for it in full. In reality, however, the capitalist pays not for the entire labour of the wage worker but only for a part of it, appropriating the so-called surplus value and growing richer. But however "concealed" the essence may be, it can nevertheless be uncovered.

## Possibility and reality

In organizing counter-revolutionary activities the local reactionaries and the enemies of the Afghan people hoped for possible victory. Possibility does not fundamentally contravene the laws of social development. However, not every possibility can be translated into reality. Let us analyse the essence of this law to understand this and other aspects of the relationship of possibility and reality.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "Conspectus of Hegel's Book *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 251.

[2] Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 817.

*Possibility is a totality of conditions,* prerequisites and reasons for the emergence of something new, the ability of matter to give rise to something new in the process of development. Possibility is what has not yet come to pass, what does not yet exist in its entirety but what can come into existence under certain conditions.

*Reality* is what has already been realised and what actually exists.

Possibility and reality are closely interrelated.

The essence of the law of the relationship between possibility and reality is that possibility is born of reality itself and that the reality of one process or object or another is always a realized possibility. Possibility and reality are different stages of the development of objective processes, objects and phenomena, because all of them were possibilities before becoming reality. The development of nature and society constitutes and endless process of the emergence of possibilities and their becoming reality. The acorn contains the possibility of the oak. Capitalism harbours the possibility of war. However, the probability of a possibility becoming reality is not the same in all objects and processes. This realisation only takes place under certain objective conditions as a consequence of the implementation of the requirements of objective laws of development. When this process of the translation of a possibility into reality is a consequence of the solution of the main contradiction as a result of the operation of basic laws of development, it takes place out of necessity and possibility always becomes reality. But when the translation of possibility into reality has nothing to do with the operation of objective laws or when this process contravenes the requirements of laws, possibility never becomes reality.

The possibility of democratic, proletarian revolutions in exploiter societies is related in one way or another to the requirements of the objective laws of social development and that is why it necessarily becomes reality sooner or later.

The emergent countries have today two options, two possibilities for building a new, more progressive society: they can either develop along capitalist or socialist lines. But only one of these options ensures that this possibility becomes a reality. The objective laws of social development make it imperative for the attainment of this goal to create the more favourable conditions for the development of the productive forces and first and foremost of their main component, man. This can only be achieved on the basis of the public ownership of the means of production on the condition that power is in the hands of the working people themselves and that conditions for the personal happiness of everyone are provided according to a general plan, that is, only under socialism. It follows that it is necessary to act in accordance with the requirements of objective laws, that is, to choose the socialist road of development, for the possibility of building such a society to become a reality. It is only at the early stage that the capitalist way of development creates a semblance of economic revival. Later on, as the practice of the development of this type of society in many countries shows, it gives rise to new, antagonistic contradictions and society is confronted with the need for another revolution. The possibility of building a fair society under capitalism therefore cannot be realised. Similarly, the possibility of the victory of counter-revolution in Afghanistan will never become reality because the attempts of the reactionary forces to revert society to its old state contradict the requirements of objective laws. On the contrary, a revolution upholding the cause of the people is in accord with the requirements of the laws of social development and will therefore win. It should be borne in mind that proper conditions and a proper stage of development are required for a possibility to become reality. In addition, to achieve this goal, the active operation of the subjective factor, the conscious activity of the social forces, classes, and parties are needed in society, necessarily in accordance with the requirements of objective laws.

This is precisely what the peoples, and the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries are doing in building the fairest society on Earth with due account of the laws of history and in accordance with scientific principles.

## Objective and Subjective Dialectics. Its Categories

There is objective and subjective dialectics. Objective dialectics consists of real processes of development and universal interrelations which are inherent in nature itself. The reflection of these processes in social consciousness is subjective dialectics. Subjective dialectics as a system of knowledge can be materialist and idealist. Materialist dialectics differs from idealist in that all its conclusions and principles constitute a rather complete and accurate reflection of the processes of reality in man's mind, whereas the conclusions of idealist dialectics are in the final analysis a consequence of the reflection of the processes of thinking alone. For this reason materialist dialectics is *truth* because *truth* is what accurately corresponds to reality. That is why materialist dialectics is scientific.

Conversely, idealist dialectics, which derives all its principles from thinking, which bases them on thinking and which never checks them against reality, thus disregarding their correspondence to reality, is unscientific dialectics.

Reflecting the dynamic processes of the objective world which are accompanied by revolutionary upheavals, materialist dialectics constitutes a revolutionary doctrine, which makes Marxism creative and revolutionary. That is why when revolutionary parties, guided by dialectical materialist sociology, stress the inevitability and law-governed nature of revolution in exploiter societies, it is not their invention but a scientific reflection of the processes of reality, a reflection of the more essential aspects of the objective world.

It follows from this that it is necessary to study and comprehend materialist dialectics and to be guided by its conclusions. These make it easier to see every phenomenon as objective, developing and interconnected with other phenomena and serve as the guiding principles and methods of cognizing and transforming the world. That is why the working people and their parties show constant concern for studying and developing dialectics as a science that makes it possible to cognize and transform the present and also to foresee the future. As a science, dialectics gives an insight into the dialectics of the objective world, including the dialectics of social processes, indicates the prospects for their development and pinpoints the main link in the chain of historical events. With this aim in view dialectics develops its *principles, concepts* and *categories* so that they reflect the essence of real processes to the fullest extent.

*The principles of dialectics* are the guiding ideas and basic rules of conduct which reflect in a generalised form the more essential characteristics of the objective world and are applicable to all realms of phenomena, from which any particular principle has been deduced (abstracted). As everything in the world develops and development is a universal, inalienable and fundamental property of reality, dialectics as a science reflects this fact in the principle of *development*; as everything in the world is interconnected and interdependent, dialectics formulates the *principle of universal relationship* and the *principle of causality;* as representatives of different classes interpret differently the conclusions of science and facts of social reality and unite into parties to substantiate and defend their views, dialectics as a science reflects this reality in the *principles of party and class approach.* These principles of dialectics enable the working people and their vanguard to see that the bourgeois ideologists resort to the smokescreen of demagogic pronouncements about the unity of nation, faith and so on to impose on the people the interests of the class of the bourgeoisie, the bourgeois parties and their ideological henchmen. The working people should always adopt a party and class approach to social phenomena and always be guided by this principle.

*Categories* are the more general concepts used by one science or another to reflect the surrounding world and to express the basic content of our knowledge. Political economy, for instance, operates with such categories as commodity, money, profit, etc. The categories of materialist dialectics differ from the categories of other sciences in that they are the more general, blanket concepts reflecting the most essential and fundamental properties, connections and relationships of the material world. These categories include the concepts of matter, motion, consciousness, quantity, quality, law, cause, effect, essence and phenomenon, content and form, and others.

Categories are not given ready-made but formulated in the long historical process of cognition. The more profound knowledge people attain, the fuller and more precise the extent to which the categories reflect the content of the phenomenon under study. Categories, as it were, record the nature and the level of knowledge attained and are called for this reason *stages of cognition.*

As knowledge develops, not only the content expressed by one category or another changes but the very number of categories grows and in their totality they reflect the surrounding world to a fuller extent.

Dialectical materialists differ fundamentally from metaphysicians and idealists in their interpretation of categories.

Some metaphysicians and idealists deny the relationship between categories and concepts, on the one hand, and real processes, on the other, and regard them as independent products of the mind that come into being and exist prior to experience and independently from it and hence do not develop together with the development of the world and its cognition. We have seen, however, that man in fact forms categories not arbitrarily but while reflecting diverse features, properties and relationships of the objective world. Categories are subjective only in form and objective in their content. That is why, by mastering philosophical categories, one can go deeper in cognizing the world, far deeper than when it is studied directly.

For this reason every category has profound methodological importance, which has already been discussed at length when various processes of the objective world were analysed.

What are the general conclusions to be made from what has been said in this chapter?

To begin with, it is clear that the world changes and develops in accordance with the requirements of objective laws. The more universal of these laws are the basic laws of dialectics—the law of the unity and struggle of opposites, the law of the mutual transformation of quantitative and qualitative changes and the law of the negation of negation.

All the processes and phenomena of the objective world are closely interconnected, and this interrelationship is law-governed in nature. This law-governed interdependence finds expression in the secondary laws of dialectics—stable, recurrent and inherent relationships between the individual, the particular and the universal; appearance and essence; content and form; cause and effect; necessity and chance; possibility and reality, and so on.

Scientific analysis of all these laws enabled the founders of Marxism-

Leninism to work out a coherent theoretical system—materialist dialectics. As a science, dialectics helps the working people and their revolutionary parties to make unprecedented accomplishments in cognizing and transforming social development in a revolutionary way. It is only natural that Engels spoke of materialist dialectics as the best working tool and sharpest weapon and that Lenin pointed out that dialectics is the actual and living heart of Marxism.

### *Test Questions*

1. What is development? What concepts of development do you know?
2. What is a law and what laws of development do you know?
3. Name the non-basic laws of dialectics. Describe the essence of each of them.
4. Define objective and subjective dialectics. Name the basic principles and categories of materialist dialectics.

*Chapter VI*

# IS THE WORLD AROUND US COGNIZABLE AND HOW DOES MAN COGNISE IT?

It has already been mentioned that the fundamental question of philosophy has two aspects, one dealing with the relationships between spirit and nature, consciousness and matter and the other with the cognisability of the world. Philosophers disagree not only on what is primary and what is secondary but also on whether the world is cognisable. Idealists believe that the material world has been produced by "world reason", "world spirit" or the "absolute idea". Therefore in order to cognise the world, it is necessary to cognise the "world reason" or "world spirit" itself, which is beyond the power of man's mind.

These arguments to the effect of the impossibility of cognising the world were given by idealist philosophers in ancient times and by subjective idealists, such as the British philosopher David Hume (1711-1776) and the German philosopher Immanuel Kant.

Modern agnostics (from the Greek *a*–not, and gnosis–knowledge) and irrationalists (from the Latin *irrationalis*–defying the possibility for the rational) deny the role the mind has to play in cognition because they want to prevent the progressive forces from seeing the world the way it is in reality rather than because they themselves doubt the possibility of cognising the world. Biblical Adam and Eve were driven out of the garden of Eden for being curious, and the curiosity our contemporaries display is even more dangerous. They want to know why there is no justice in the world–why some are rich, while others are poor, why some people have to serve others, why wars flare up and who is to blame. These questions are plentiful. The more reactionary idealist philosophers therefore seek to convince people that this type of knowledge is not to be attained by anybody and that we will never be able to unravel the mysteries of nature and human society.

True, it is becoming increasingly difficult today to deny the cognisability of the world. Had we been blind to what is going on around us, we would not have been able to build planes or rockets nor to send them to other planets. This is what people in growing numbers think. That is why idealists, too, make the necessary adjustments. Some of them in principle admit that the world is cognisable and even work out theories of cognition, but in doing so focus on cognising their own thoughts rather than on cognising the objective world and human society. Others are invited to cognise their own sensations and to resort to intuition and supernatural spirits to aid man's mind. For instance, the West German philosopher, Herman von Petersdorff claimed that without the revelation of great truths through faith and without Christian mysteries our "poor mind" would have remained powerless in the face of the enigmas of the Universe. All this again aims, although in a different way, at sowing doubts about man's ability to cognise the surrounding world. Materialists, on the contrary, have always considered that the surrounding world can be cognised. Nevertheless, their early theories of knowledge had grave shortcomings. Prior to Marx they regarded cognition as the passive reflection of the surrounding environment by an individual.

This process is much more complicated in reality. Resolutely refuting agnosticism, dialectical materialism showed that the cognitive process is carried out not by some "pure" consciousness severed from man but by a real human being with the help of his mind. This philosophy asserts that the cognitive process is social in essence and nature and hence the latter cannot be understood in isolation from practical activity, which constitutes the true essence of man. The cognising subject is not an individual isolated from other people but a man who takes part in social life and uses forms of cognising activity developed by society, both material (tools and implements) and intellectual (language and logical categories).

Let us analyse the mechanism of cognition.

## 1. The Sensual and Logical Stages of Cognition

Early materialists were correct in thinking that man cognises the surrounding world with the help of different sense-organs. Medical observations showed that if a newly born child has all its sense-organs, including eyesight, hearing, the sense of smell, taste and touch, paralysed, it will be unable to know anything about the surrounding world and will remain almost forever in the state of oblivion. This fact shows that the sense-organs act as channels, through which information about the surrounding world reaches man's mind. Indeed, cognition begins with the outside world affecting the sense-organs and causing sensations. *Sensation is the process of turning the energy of an outside stimulus into a fact of consciousness*. This ability of man and, to a certain extent, of animals is based on *reflection*, the universal property of matter. When we look at some object light rays reflected from it act on our eyes, causing the corresponding parts of the cortex to react and creating a subjective image of that object in the mind.

An isolated sensation is not enough, however, to create an integral image in the mind. It takes a combination of sensations in the course of repeated reflection of the object perceived by the subject (man) to achieve that. A combination of sensations forms *perception*. Based on sensations, *perception* constitutes an integral reflection of an external material object directly affecting the sense-organs.

A sum total of perceptions produces *notions*, more stable images of the object being reflected. A *notion* is such an image of an object that can be mentally reproduced without being directly observed or acted upon. Being visual images of objects not directly present, notions are less vivid and clear-cut than perceptions. Conceptual images have as a result fewer details and are more generalised in nature. At the same time weakened relations between the image and the object account for the appearance of transformed images, sometimes fantastic ones. This property of reproducing images and compensating their weakened features is called *imagination*. Imagination, however, may result in thought becoming severed from reality and producing false ideas through exaggeration or absolutising one aspect of reality or another, say, ideas of angels, God and so on. In other words, it is at the stage of imagination that erroneous ideas about reality and a distorted idealistic view of the world can be formed. This severance of the idea is, however, possible only under certain circumstances. In general the cognitive process is not limited to this. Notions formed at the stage of sensual cognition serve as a basis for wider generalisations, comparison of the information received with already available knowledge, the singling out of the more essential characteristics, properties and aspects of the object being reflected, to form *concepts* of them. To work out a concept of some object or phenomenon, the mind makes use not only of the information received through sensual contemplation but also subjects it to analysis, synthesis, abstraction from everything of secondary importance and then to generalization. These complicated mental operations give birth to a *concept* as a reflection of the necessary and essential properties. A *concept* is a reflection of objects and phenomena in their essential characteristics. The development of concepts ushers in the second stage of cognition, *abstract thinking*. A concept is the earliest form in the abstract stage of cognition and thinking. Man, bird, mountain, table and so on are all concepts. Besides working out concepts, the mind operates them, connecting them in *statements*, which constitute another form of thinking. Concepts are, as a rule, intended to reflect certain aspects or the sum total of essential aspects and properties of things, whereas statements establish relations between these aspects and properties, on the one hand, and things and phenomena themselves, on the other. Thus, statements constitute a sum total of two or more concepts connected between themselves. For instance, the statement "all people are mortal" has two connected concepts "people" and "mortality". More complicated statements conveying a number of essential characteristics are used to describe more complicated processes and phenomena.

Statements play a tremendous role in cognition: any definition, hypotheses, law and scientific theory is conveyed in the form of statements.

But concepts and statements merely record the information about objects and processes received on the basis of reflection and their essential characteristics and state that this information is available. In order to learn something new about things and phenomena being reflected, it is necessary to compare them with other statements, which in one form or another contain information about similar things and phenomena. A sum total of statements used in analysing the information received about objects and phenomena forms a *conclusion*.

A *conclusion* is a form of thinking, in which a new statement is deduced from one or several statements, leading as a result from the unknown to the known, from ignorance to knowledge. For example, we have two statements:

1. Every proletarian or national-democratic revolution is a progressive phenomenon in the history of human society.
2. The Saur Revolution in Afghanistan is a national democratic revolution.

The conclusion is: The Saur Revolution in Afghanistan is a progressive phenomenon.

A sum total of statements and conclusions forms entire systems of knowledge in either complete or incomplete form (theories or hypotheses). All these theories are more or less truthful or false depending on how they reflect the world, that is to say, appropriately, in an undistorted way, or arbitrarily, in a distorted way. As the real world constantly moves, develops and changes, human knowledge, too, constantly develops and the cognitive process never ceases.

To sum up, the cognitive process has two stages in its ascension from *sensual contemplation* (sensation, perception and notion) to *abstraction* (concept, statement, conclusion, hypothesis and theory).

Each stage is of paramount importance for the cognitive process because cognition cannot be of full value if results obtained at one stage of cognition or another are ignored. It is necessary to spell this out because there are philosophers who recognise either sensual cognition alone, trusting only their sensations and rejecting the role of thinking (*sensualists*—from the Latin *sensus* meaning a sense, sensation) or absolutize rational cognition (*rationalists*—from the Latin *ratio* meaning reason).

Those who deny sensual cognition argue that we cannot depend on our sensations and that the sense-organs give unreliable evidence. For instance, if we lower a stick into water it will seem to be broken or crooked and if we look at a road stretching far away it will seem to be narrowing. But we do know that the stick remains straight and unbroken when placed in water and that the road we move along has the same width throughout its length, provided it was in fact built that way. Hence the conclusion that the sense-organs "deceive" us and cannot be relied upon. This is not so, however. The thing is that, looking at the "broken" stick or the "narrowing" road, agnostics ignore the elementary law of physics. Whereas every schoolchild knows that light beams falling on one object or another located in the air or in water have *different angles of reflection*. This means that the light beam reflected from the end of the stick just above the water level and the light beam that had passed through the body of water and reflected from the end of the stick under it will fall on the retina at different angles, creating the effect of a "broken" stick. Consequently, our senses, far from deceiving us, managed to register even this slightest difference in reflection. We would have been indeed deceived, had we seen that stick straight in water! The effect of a "narrowing" road has also to do with the physical peculiarities of perceiving perspective. At the same time the importance of the sense-organs in the cognitive process should not be overestimated. Even if they do reflect correctly the surrounding world, they in themselves are not sufficient when we want to get at the essence of phenomena, objects and processes. If man relied on the sense-organs alone in cognising the world we would only know the external aspects of objects. And this is sometimes deluding. It seems to us that the Sun moves around the Earth, which we know is not true. Water may sometimes seem to be "crystal clear" while in fact there are thousands of living organisms–microbes–in it. For this reason the sensualists, who maintain that we can do without thinking in cognition, are mistaken. True thinking based on the perception of real facts, far from taking us away from reality, on the contrary, brings us closer to it, helping us to grasp its essence. The cognitive process consists in the complicated synthetic activity of both the sense-organs and the mind.

It is impossible therefore to agree with rationalists, who overestimate and absolutize the role of thinking in cognition. They put forth the concept of intellectual intuition, with the help of which the mind can allegedly grasp the essence of things and processes directly, bypassing sensual data. At the same time the role of sensual experience is belittled and viewed as merely giving an impetus to mental activity and serving to illustrate ideas.

Some rationalists even arrived at the idea of innate knowledge, in particular, in the form of basic concepts of mathematics and logics

(Descartes). Kant held a somewhat different view, recognising to some extent the data received through sensual perception, if only as forms of cognition.

Relying on the conclusions of natural sciences, dialectical materialism states that there is neither "pure" sensual contemplation nor "pure" thinking. Knowledge constitutes a blend of sensual and rational reflection. The rational and the sensual are fundamental to any cognition. At the same time it is possible and necessary to single out different levels and qualitatively distinctive stages of knowledge in the cognitive process. In particular, philosophers distinguish between *empirical* and *theoretical* cognition. *Empirical* cognition offers knowledge, whose content has been received through experiment.

*Theoretical* cognition constitutes such a level of knowledge, at which the object is reflected from the point of view of its relations and regular features established not only in the course of experiment but also directly as a result of abstract thinking.

The level of cognition is determined not only by the way knowledge was obtained, be it experimentally or theoretically, but also by *how* and *to what extent* it reflects the object, that is to say, whether it is reflected in all its relations and mediations or from one, albeit very important, side. From this point of view cognition is usually divided into *concrete* and *abstract*. Abstract thinking constitutes the highest stage of cognition. With its help man draws conclusions about the essence, inner relations and laws of the development of objects and phenomena, which are not directly observed by him. Abstract thinking leads to generalizations and such knowledge that is characteristic of the analysis of not only a given object or phenomenon but of the entire class of similar objects and phenomena. When describing his method, Marx singled out two stages in the process of recreating concrete reality by the mind—from concrete reality to abstract definitions, and further on to the mental recreation of the concrete. This operation is carried out with the help of special *methods*.

Let us analyse the main methods of scientific cognition.

## 2. Methods and Forms of Scientific Cognition

In the course of the cognitive process man acts in the world not only as a spectator or a passive contemplator but as a creator, too. He does not merely reflect objects and processes acting on him but treats them selectively. That is why the method used by man to compare, select and realise different knowledge, to cognise and transform the surrounding world, has a great role to play in the cognitive process. An incorrect method used in tackling one problem or another, in cognising and revealing the essence of one phenomenon or another will require additional effort and time from the researcher or may land him to an impasse. Conversely, a correct method facilitates the cognitive process. Françis Bacon (1561-1626) pointed out that the scientific method is like a beam of light making it possible for man to orient himself in the darkness of the unknown.

*The method* (from the Greek *methodos* meaning literally "a going after something") *is a way of mentally recreating essential aspects and characteristics of the object under study and also a way of attaining some goal and regulating one's activity while transforming reality.*

The content of the method is the sum total of devices and requirements for ensuring the attainment of the goal and also principles underlying these devices and requirements.

Dialectical materialists radically differ from idealist philosophers in their understanding of method. From the point of view of dialectical materialism the devices and requirements used to attain some goal, though selected by the subject, nevertheless constitute certain rules our mind saw in reality itself. Man can act successfully, transform and change one object or process or another only provided his actions do not contradict the logic of processes and phenomena of reality itself and provided his theory and practice are harmonized with the requirements imposed by the laws of reality. That is to say, scientific philosophy proceeds from the fact that the method has an objective foundation.

Idealists see the method as a sum total of rules arbitrarily formulated by the human intellect to make cognition "easier". Therefore the method is a purely subjective conception for idealists.

Such an idealistic interpretation of method enables the ideologists of the bourgeoisie to *distort* the concept of reality in their own interests. For instance, pragmatists insist that only one criterion should be used in cognizing reality, namely, whether it is useful or not. If it is expedient for a robber to strip his victim of his property the robber's actions are justified. As it is profitable and useful for the imperialists and their allies to plunder economically poor countries and to impose their will on them, their actions are also deemed justified. Needless to say, such a "method" of cognition and such actions are not only unscientific but also reactionary.

Dialectical materialists consider the method of cognition to be correct only when it is based on real processes and reflects precisely the laws of reality itself. It can be said, for instance, that the Marxist dialectical method teaches us to view phenomena in their development and transformation not because it is "useful", "profitable" or "economical" but because development and transformation exist in reality, that is, they are objective.

No doubt, the application of one method of cognition or another is determined not only by the philosophical position but also by the historical level of the development of knowledge. The emergence of the metaphysical method in the 17th-18th centuries is explained by the inadequate level of the development of knowledge. The emergence of the dialectical method in the 1840s became possible owing to a higher level of scientific development. Yet it is still class reasons that account for the choice of one method or another, especially the principal methods. The bourgeois ideologists opted for precisely the metaphysical method because it enables them to prove that capitalism is eternal and that the existing exploiter system is unshakeable.

Let us turn back, however, to the methods themselves, their peculiarities and classification. It is necessary to distinguish between the methods and practical instructions, a certain sequence recommended for performing a specific scientific or practical task, an especially worked-out order of applying methods selected for this.

It is also necessary to distinguish between these two and the *methodology*, which is the sum total of general, universal principles as applied to the solution of problems. It is a doctrine of the method and the theoretical justification of both the principles themselves and ways of using them, of the order, means and methods of cognition.

Marxism-Leninism as an integral whole, that is to say, dialectical materialism, Marxist political economy and scientific socialism, forms the methodology of revolutionary thinking and revolutionary activity. Dialectical materialism is pivotal to Marxism-Leninism, being the methodology of Marxism itself. In other words, dialectical materialism is the *universal methodology*, which develops the more profound doctrine of the method and equips people with the dialectical method of cognizing and transforming the world.

It can be concluded from this that dialectical materialism and the dialectical method are not identical conceptions. The former has a wider meaning than the latter because it includes, besides dialectics, the laws of materialism. Dialectical materialism as the most general and far-reaching theory of the relationship between the objective world and thought is identical with the conception of the general theory of nature, society and thought. Hence it can be said that *the methodology is the most general theory of cognizing, transforming and utilizing nature, society and thinking.*

At the same time theory and methodology should not be identified. Though they do have much in common, they also differ from each other. Methodology is a means of acquiring knowledge and transforming reality, whereas theory is knowledge itself. For this reason it is more appropriate to say that methodology is theory in action. In this sense every law formulated by science and its every fundamental conclusion serve as a regulator of sorts, which guides further cognition and the mastering of a subject. In this way the law of the decisive role played by social being with respect to social consciousness, which was discovered by Marx, acts as the guiding principle in analyzing all social phenomena.

All methods of scientific cognition can be divided either by the functions they perform or by their degree of universality.

As far as their functions are concerned, it is necessary to distinguish the historical and logical, empirical and theoretical, natural and model, and other methods of research.

As far as their universality is concerned, it is necessary to distinguish the universal philosophical method, general scientific methods and special methods of special sciences.

Let us consider every method in more detail.

*The historical method* constitutes such an approach to cognizing the processes of the development of reality, which requires that these development stages should be analyzed in their chronological sequence and in the concrete forms of their historical manifestations. For instance, scholars are already now undertaking analysis of the essence and peculiarities of the Saur revolution in Afghanistan. The historical method demands that they should start describing this great process beginning with the moment of its inception and go on describing in strict chronological order all its facts and forms, which exemplify its most essential aspects.

*The logical method* is the method of analyzing the logic of facts, the natural process of development and the laws that determine this process, the unfolding of its essence, the mechanism and means of its implementation. Thus, from the point of view of the historical method, it is important to point out that the Saur Revolution took place on Saur 7, 1978,' that it was inaugurated by the onslaught of a tank unit, that the envoys of the rebellious forces were fired at in the residence of Daud and so on, whereas the logical method insists on analyzing the objective contradictions that had caused the revolution, the nature of their resolution in the course of the revolution, the ideological motives and revolutionary ideas that inspired the participants in the revolution to acts of heroism, and so on.

The historical and the logical largely coincide in a real process, though there are certain differences, as we may see. That is why, though scientific cognition uses the two aforementioned methods in order to make an all-embracing analysis of the essence of the process, it also requires that the historical approach should coincide with the logical approach in research.

*Empirical methods* of cognition include methods used at the empirical level of knowledge. *Observation* and *experiment* are the main forms of acquiring scientific knowledge at this level.

*Observation* records the existence of some phenomenon and its changes in space and time. Scientific observation is characterized by a conception and a plan worked out beforehand. It is supported by instruments (microscope, field-glasses and so on) enabling the researcher to observe something not directly perceived. Auguste Comte (1798-1857) said that mankind would never be able to learn the chemical composition of stars. And yet a short while later this mystery had been solved. The other side of the Moon, hidden from direct observation, can now also be seen with the help of instruments.

*Experiment* is a specific form of practical activity in science and one of its key methods. It is used as a means of exercizing material influence on objects with the aim of cognizing them. Its peculiarity consists in the fact that it is carried out on the researcher's plan in specially created and strictly controlled conditions. It also makes wide use of different installations, apparatus and computers.

*Theoretical methods*, used in thinking, differ in the degree of their general nature and as has already been mentioned are interconnected and interpenetrate one another.

*The universal philosophical method* is the most far-reaching and general method of cognition, which operates in all fields of cognition and practice and is the sum total of the more general principles and requirements regulating and guiding any conscious activity. These principles and requirements include *objective, comprehensive* and *concrete* analysis of any phenomenon in life. These principles are determined by the world outlook of dialectical materialism, namely, by the recognition of matter as primary with respect to consciousness, the universal interconnectedness and development of phenomena. The content of the law of the unity and struggle of opposites forms the core of the universal method. We have already seen that this law demands that in every process under study the researcher should lay bare contradictory aspects and tendencies, get at the innermost source of development and cognize things through the unity and struggle of opposites. Principles, stemming from the law of the mutual transformation of quantitative and qualitative changes and the law of the negation of negation act as elements of the universal dialectical method. These laws guide the researcher towards cognizing the qualitative and quantitative aspects of phenomena, gradual changes and leaps in development and towards taking into account the links between the old and the new, the peculiar repetition of individual development stages, and their direction, etc.

Requirements of paramount importance are also laid upon the researcher by other laws of dialectics, whose methodological functions have already been discussed. There also are some laws of social development to be discussed in subsequent chapters which, when reflected in theory, also act as special methods (adherence to Party principles, class principles, and so on).

*General scientific methods* are used in sciences and include *analysis, synthesis, induction, deduction*, and *analogy*. They are not connected with any particular subject of research, though everyone of them has its own purpose, incorporates strictly defined devices and differs in this from the universal philosophical method.

*Analysis* is an actual or mental dissection of an object into its components with the aim of studying its structure and composition.

*Synthesis* is a process of correlating every element with the whole and the reconstruction of the whole in keeping with the pattern of its structure and functioning as revealed by analysis. Analysis and synthesis are inseparable.

*Induction* presupposes advance in cognition from the particular to the general, from facts to theoretical conclusions. It draws, as a rule, on observation and experiment. For instance, when it was discovered that some metals can conduct electric current, the general conclusion was made that all metals were conductors of electricity. Induction can be *complete* and *incomplete*. Complete induction is possible only when the number of objects is limited. Otherwise induction is incomplete, and this accounts for the limited nature of this method.

*Deduction* is a strictly logical inferrence of some new authentic knowledge on the basis of several statements and premises. As a rule, it presupposes the movement of thought from the *general* to the particular, from a law to its manifestations. Thus, knowledge that the world is material and has nothing in it which might exist prior to matter makes it unnecessary to determine in studying one specific object or another whether it is material or not. The method of deduction envisages that any object is treated as being material. As deduction does not explain how this original knowledge was attained, it is necessary to turn to induction, that is why the two methods are often inseparable.

*The method of analogy* consists in establishing the similarity in some properties and relations between phenomena that are not identical. For instance, certain similarity between some aspects of sound and light led the Dutch physicist, Christian Huygens (1629-1695) to the idea that light was composed of waves, which was subsequently confirmed scientifically. At the same time conclusions based on analogy are problematic and require additional verification and the use of other methods. For this reason it is employed in close association with other methods, particularly modelling.

Alongside the aforementioned methods, different forms forwarding knowledge are used in the cognitive process, among them *facts, hypotheses, scientific problems,* and *scientific theories*.

*Facts* form the groundwork of any knowledge, and no conclusion is possible without them. They are provided by sense perceptions and sense-organs. Events, phenomena and processes that take place in reality and that are directly confirmed by observation or experiment are referred to as facts. In other words, a fact is a moment of reality, which comes into focus in the cognitive process. To establish facts is the initial and simplest, although very important, scientific procedure. Scientific conclusion depends on the facts that have been established. It is for this reason that facts should be chosen with great care. Lenin warned that it is inadmissible to consider only individual facts and juggle with examples, and make scientific conclusions on this basis. It is necessary to take not isolated facts but the sum total of circumstances related to the problem under discussion.[1]

At the same time knowledge of facts is not yet genuine scientific knowledge; to acquire that the essence and law of that which gives birth to these facts should be discovered. And this can only be attained when facts are correctly selected and scientifically analyzed.

The selection of the necessary facts, namely, those that have to be explained, gives rise to *scientific problems.*

*A scientific problem* is a problem requiring additional research for its solution; it is the fact of knowing that something is unknown. Scientific problems arise when we deal with facts, become aware that our knowledge of them is incomplete and intend to fill that gap. The process of solving a scientific problem has to do with a certain degree of the development of a corresponding theory and with the singling out of those aspects that the new facts contradict. The *purpose* of research and the field of possible *hypotheses* are defined on this basis.

*A hypothesis* is a scientifically substantiated surmise about the existence of one phenomenon or another, that is, a theory that has not yet been verified, but is probable in nature. Our surmises about life on other planets, about the possibility of precluding a third world war and so on can be cited here as examples of hypothesis. To become authentic knowledge, a hypothesis should be proved, which is carried out either through experiment or with the help of scientifically substantiated logical conclusions. A hypothesis, which has been proved and confirmed in practice, becomes *a theory.*

*A scientific theory* is a system of basic ideas, concepts, laws and principles, which reflect in a general form the outside world, as well as the material and intellectual activity of people. A theory is a form of scientific knowledge, which gives an integral idea of the regularities and essential relationships of reality.

In every concrete field general scientific methods are complemented by specific methods of research used in special sciences. Special methods are used to study specific objects and to solve concrete problems of one science or another. Special methods are exemplified by the differentiation and integration methods used in mathematics, methods of polling used in concrete sociological studies, the method of traces used in biology, etc.

All this shows that methods and scientific methodology have a great role to play in cognition. It follows from this that every man, whether he is engaged in research or performs other social duties, should constantly master the scientific methods of cognition and the scientific Marxist-Leninist methodology.

---

[1] See V. I. Lenin, "Statistics and Sociology", *Collected Works,* Vol. 23, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1964, p. 272.

It is necessary to be able to use the Marxist-Leninist methodology because in any type of activity man always wants to act with greatest precision and efficiency. This can be accomplished when he makes no mistakes and knows truth. Any cognition or practical activity aims at attaining truth or getting the result which corresponds to the goal set to the utmost extent.

## 3. What Is Truth?

It may seem easy to answer this question. It is common knowledge that truth is that which has not been thought up and that corresponds to something existing in reality itself. If you are told that it is raining outside, when this is not the case in reality, the statement is not truthful but false. This is the approach which has been worked out by mankind's entire experience and is adopted by dialectical materialists with regard to truth. This approach to the question of truth is not shared by everybody, however. I have already mentioned earlier how some representatives of bourgeois philosophy understand truth, namely that it is that which is useful. On the whole idealist philosophers distort truth in every possible way. This is only natural because they consider nature secondary and therefore correlate not thoughts with reality but, on the contrary, tailored reality to the "principles" and "inferences" they have thought up. Some trends of idealist philosophy connect the conception of truth with faith in "supreme reason", "religious revelations", "heavenly truth" and so on. As has been shown by science, "heavenly truth" stands just as far away from truth as the sky from the Earth. To share similar views of truth amounts to denying truth and confusing it with falsities and delusions.

The dialectical materialist interpretation of truth radically differs from sundry idealist interpretations current among modern bourgeois philosophers.

From the point of view of dialectical materialism *truth* is the complete and exact reflection of real processes in man's mind and thoughts. Truth is the correspondence between an ideal image and the object and, consequently, its content does not depend either on man or society and is objective. In his work *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* Lenin says that objective truth is such a content of human ideas that "does not depend on a subject, that does not depend either on a human being or on humanity".[1]

But it is nature itself that exists objectively. Perhaps then nature is truth? Of course, not. That which exists can be neither true nor false: it is just there. It is only people's knowledge that can be either true or false.

---

[1] See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 122.

Depending on whether truth is discovered at once, fully and in all its integrity or is only mastered partially and approximately, philosophers distinguish between *relative* and *absolute* truths.

*Relative truth* is such knowledge that correctly reflects objective reality only in some aspects and relations. *Truth is always concrete.* This is to say that it is valid only in some concrete case, in some concrete field of the existing world, at a given time and so forth.

When circumstances change and the world develops, it often happens that truth becomes outdated and requires some corrections; moreover, when conditions that had produced it disappear it sometimes turns into altogether unreliable knowledge. Hence there are no abstract truths suitable for any occasion. The question arises therefore whether it is worth speaking about truth at all. Indeed if during the cognitive process we only attain such knowledge that becomes outdated with the passage of time and may even be refuted, wouldn't it be more wise to suppose that there are no authentic, final and *absolute* truths in general? Some philosophers in fact argue that all our knowledge is of temporal value and constantly changes, that is to say, it is *relative* and incomplete, and that therefore our knowledge of the world is conventional and approximate. We can never know something for sure nor attain the ultimately authentic knowledge. These philosophers are called *relativists* (from the Latin *relativus*, meaning "relative").

Other philosophers go even farther, stating that those truths that become outdated and require to be corrected and studied more thoroughly are no truths at all. "Genuine" truths "never become outdated"; they are eternal, given once and for all, and are truths of supreme authority. These philosophers are called *dogmatists*, because for them truths are dogmas, that is eternal and unchanging ideas given once and for all.

It may all sound quite true on the face of it: the content of any object is much richer than our idea of it, that is to say, our knowledge is indeed relative. On the other hand, it is impossible to doubt that two plus two always equals four, that Kabul is in Afghanistan, and so on. Why should we then brand philosophers as either relativists or dogmatists?

Dialectical materialists do not deny that our knowledge is *relative* nor question the existence of both relative and *absolute*, eternal truths but oppose both relativism and dogmatism. Most truths and scientific ideas are indeed relative. In the cognitive process mankind indeed always proceeds from ignorance to knowledge and from incomplete knowledge to fuller knowledge, correcting old knowledge or discarding it altogether. This does not mean, however, that there is no grain of absolute truth in knowledge incorporated in relative truths or that we cannot rely on them. In fact it is the other way around.

Indeed, if we discover with the passage of time that relative truths have to be corrected, complemented or altered, this attests that we have learnt something, that our knowledge grows and probes deeper into the phenomenon, and that there are indeed no obstacles to mankind's cognizing nature. The more we "improve" relative truths, complementing them with new knowledge and discarding outdated ideas and inaccuracies from these truths, the more absolute knowledge is contained in subsequent relative truths. The sum total of relative truths eventually creates absolute truth. It is precisely the sum total of relative truths, their amendments and improvements that give birth to fuller knowledge and absolute knowledge. Absolute knowledge or *absolute truth* is complete, authentic, unquestioned and exhaustive knowledge in which the image coincides with the object and which cannot be refuted in the future within the bounds of the given coincidence. As nature is boundless, there will never be a truth that would be able to reflect the world in its entirety. Any absolute truth will in one way or another need to be amended and will be amended with the development of knowledge. It is absurd to lay bounds to human knowledge, consequently, even absolute truths are in a certain sense relative. For this reason our knowledge is both absolute and relative. One should not go to extremes, reducing it all to relativity and overstating the importance of the relative (as relativists do) or insisting on only absolute truths, while severing them from relative truths and disregarding the fact that absolute truths, too, are relative to a certain extent (as dogmatists do). Thus in its time the conception of the material nature of the world was complemented with knowledge of its dialectical nature. The world is made not just of matter, but of *developing matter*, etc. Absolute truth should be distinguished from eternal truth, such as that the people of Mozambique are clever and diligent and that the Great October Socialist Revolution took place in Russia.

The correct understanding of the theory of truth is of great methodological importance in social practice. The relativist conception leads to scepticism and throws doubt about the reliability of our knowledge and about the possibility to cognize the world and to transform it. Dogmatism tries to use the same yardstick in analyzing the most diverse phenomena and to solve multifarious tasks all in the same way; it ignores specific conditions, in which one process or another takes place, and obstructs creative activity. Both relativism and dogmatism cause great damage to social practice and should be rejected.

In order to make the final judgement as to whether we deal with truth or a delusion, it is necessary to be able to check the veracity of knowledge, that is, to have a *yardstick* of truth. When searching for it, some philosophers do not go beyond the bounds of consciousness. Baruch Spinoza (the Dutch philosopher, 1632-1677) pointed out that truth itself was the yardstick of truth. Similar to light, which reveals both itself and the dark, truth is the yardstick of itself and of falsehoods.

But how can truth be verified with the help of truth, that is, with the help of something that has to be verified itself? After all how can a man measure his height with the help of his height? He has to have a tape-measure for that.

Some philosophers assert that truth is that which has general value and is agreed upon by all and everyone.

However, how can truth pertaining to incompatible interests of opposite classes be of general value? One cannot hold two water melons in one hand. Likewise the interests of the exploiters and those of the exploited are incompatible. What is then the yardstick of truth that would not depend on people's wishes and views and would be objective?

Dialectical materialists believe social practice to be such a yardstick. *Practice* is the material goal-oriented activity of people aimed at transforming nature and society. It incorporates both agricultural production, the production of material benefits and the revolutionary activity of the mass of the people in transforming society.

If our knowledge is confirmed by practice it means that it is authentic and reliable and there is no need to doubt it. The accuracy (authenticity) of calculations made by a designer is verified by practice. For instance, the accuracy of the computations carried out by Soviet scientists was confirmed by practice when a Soviet rocket "landed" on the Moon in a strictly specified place. And conversely, theories that do not stand the test of practice are fallacious. It is precisely practice that is the best touchstone of the authenticity of a theory because we cognize the world in order to improve man's activity and social practice rather than for the sake of idle curiosity. Ideas proposed by inventors and scientists have value only when they can be translated into life and put into human practice. But can every idea be put into practice? We have already seen that this is only possible with regard to those of them that do not contradict the requirements of objective laws, that is, those that exactly reflect reality and correspond to it. This means that if an idea is put into practice in keeping with the requirements of objective laws it corresponds to reality and is truthful. For this reason practice is the touchstone of any theory. It is important to recognize practice as a yardstick of truth not only for the sake of theory but also for the sake of everyday life. The efficiency of one enterprise or production group or another is judged by their performance and practical results rather than by their plans. People constantly turn to practice as the yardstick of truth, in order to evaluate promises and words given. It is better to see in practice whether people are as good as their words. Counter-revolutionary elements in Afghanistan and their patrons from among the imperialists and other reactionaries in word show concern for the true believers but in deed kill and burn innocent Muslims and try to bring them again to their knees. Actions always speak louder than words, and sometimes one can learn more from experience than from the best of theories.

To sum up, *practice is the only reliable criterion of truth.*

Now let us turn back to the problem of how man cognizes the surrounding world and make one important conclusion, which was formulated by Lenin: "From living perception to abstract thought, *and from this to practice*,—such is the dialectical path of the cognition of truth."[1]

To recapitulate, the world is cognizable and our knowledge accurately reflects the world developments, providing us with truthful "information" about them. Human cognition develops from ignorance to knowledge and from incomplete knowledge to ever fuller knowledge. There are no objects in nature that cannot be cognized but there are things that have not been cognized yet and are to be uncovered through scholastic effort. That is why, guided by the principles of scientific dialectical materialism, the communist parties organize their entire practical activities in keeping with the requirements of science and strive to resolve the arising problems in a truly just and scientific way.

## *Test Questions*

1. What two conceptions on the cognizability of the world do you know?
2. Name the forms of the sensual and logical stages of cognition.
3. What is truth? What types of truth do you know?
4. What is practice and its role in cognition?
5. What conclusions should be made from the fact that the world is cognizable?

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "Conspectus of Hegel's Book *The Science of Logic*", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 171.

## *Chapter VII*

# HUMAN SOCIETY AND ITS DEVELOPMENT

It has already been pointed out that, though society abides by the more general laws of nature and thought, it develops in accordance with its own special laws. To get to the grass roots of social processes and the laws of social development, it is therefore necessary to analyze problems pertaining to human society proper. It is all the more important as no other philosophic theory prior to Marxism and no modern bourgeois sociological theory could give a satisfactory description of the essence and content of social laws or to work out genuine social science.

What is society? What is its role in human life? Why do there exist different types of society? Does society develop and what underlies its development? All these and many other problems concern not only scholars but ever growing numbers of ordinary people. This interest in the questions involved with the essence of society is especially growing in the newly free countries. Victories scored by the people in their national liberation struggle bring to the fore problems of social transformation and of building society without exploitation. It is, however, impossible to build such a society without a truly scientific theory, by relying only on intuition or sheer enthusiasm.

Dialectical materialism is a truly scientific theory of social development in the form of *historical materialism*, whose immediate object of study is the laws governing human society.

Like dialectical materialism as a whole, historical materialism was founded by Marx and Engels and further developed by Lenin.

What were social theories like prior to Marx and what were their drawbacks? For one thing, they were unscientific. Idealists believed that society was a chance conglomeration of people or an association of people, who experience need in each other, and that the functioning of society and historical events were brought about by the intertwining of the volition of individual personalities and their motives.

The role of the working people in the historical process was completely ignored. They reduced the entire history of human society to the activity of outstanding personalities. Proceeding from this, they denied the possibility of cognizing the ways of social development. Modern bourgeois sociologists, on their part, try to prove that all attempts to transform society are futile. Early materialists also failed to explain and resolve problems of social development. All this enabled bourgeois ideologists to treat social processes and social life arbitrarily and to juggle historical facts in the interests of those classes that are unwilling to change the existing conditions of social life which suit them perfectly.

Dialectical materialist sociology has proved that society, like any other natural phenomenon, develops in accordance with certain objective laws, which means that the latter are cognizable. Hence it is also possible to learn the paths of social development. Following the requirements of objective laws, it is possible to transform society effectively, working towards the establishment of better social relations, which would put an end to social inequality.

## 1. The Origin of Society

Society has not always existed, nor is it something unchangeable. The emergence and development of production activity (labour) underlay the turning of the herd of anthropoids (ancestors of man) into a primitive human herd and the latter into human society.

Why was it labour and nothing else?

We already know that at the early stages of their development our ancestors hunted for survival. The making of hunting tools was the earliest form of labour and an important factor in the development of man himself. As they developed, people produced better tools, which in turn opened prospects for their further evolution and for their acquiring higher intellectual and physical abilities. In the course of this interaction between primitive men and implements it was not only the latter and the former that changed and developed but also relations that took shape between the people themselves. The constant improvement and development of social relations produced better social conditions, in which our ancestors developed social features characteristic of human beings proper and gradually changed their mode of life. The biological and the social clashed in primitive man who went through the process of "humanization" and socialization.

In the process man developed speech, consciousness, typical of man only, and the ability to work creatively and to transform the world. It was labour, speech and social life put together that ensured that the primitive herd of ancestral people were singled out from the rest of the animal world, and developed further away from it.

It took the herd of primitive men approximately a million of years to turn into human society.

Just as it was the case with the primitive human herd, labour and the development of the productive forces (people and implements) and those relations that took shape between them in the process of labour (production relations) formed the foundation for the functioning of society.

This is only natural. In order to survive, people have to have food, dwellings and clothes. And to have these things, they have to work. Like their ancestors, people cannot work without implements and single-handed. The inequality in primeval circumstances and personal aptitudes results in the fact that every man can handle only some implements and perform only certain types of work or certain social duties. Hence, the objective need for interaction with other people in labour and for exchanging its results, that is, the need to establish certain social relations. That is why, while analyzing the origin of human society, Marx pointed out that it was not formed by simply bringing people together but was caused by their interaction in labour, their social relations with respect to the results of that labour. Keeping this in mind, Marx came to the conclusion that *society was not merely an agglomeration of the people but also included their labour, material activity and those social relations that took shape among them in exchanging activity or in other forms of intercourse.* There is no society outside the material activity of people, nor outside those relations that developed among them; the entire history of the emergence and evolution of society is the history of the emergence and evolution of labour and relations that developed among people during their joint activity. Marx, Engels and Lenin showed how society emerged and developed, basing themselves on labour and the material activity of people and analysing this objective process and the laws of its development.

Implements used in primitive society were very simple because man himself was as yet incapable of manufacturing anything better. Social relations, too, were still quite underdeveloped. Their organization was quite simple and boiled down to joint labour, equal distribution and equal duties. As a result of the fact that not everybody could put in an equal share of work and that food depended at times on being lucky in hunting, fishing and gathering different berries and fruit, society lacked constant sources of food and, consequently, there were disagreements, especially when food was distributed. Seeking to improve their material position, people not only improved their implements, but also looked for other means of satisfying their needs. This brought about the emergence of farming, the domestication of some species of animals and stock raising. This was how *the first major division of social labour into farming and stock raising* took place.

As farming and stock raising developed, and stone implements were replaced by those made of bronze and iron, people received more lasting sources of food and the chance to produce the *surplus product*, in other words, a product that remained after the essential needs of the worker were satisfied.

The appearance of the surplus product led to two important consequences in the evolution of society. First, there appeared a chance to accumulate that product, to stockpile different kinds of material wealth and to redistribute it. This produced an economic basis for inequality. That is to say, there emerged conditions, which enabled some people to seize cattle, implements and foodstuffs, while others were stripped of all this. Plunder became possible, as well as armed conflicts to acquire wealth. Second, exploitation, i. e. the appropriation of products of one man's labour by another man, became also possible. While people produced only enough to feed themselves, it was impossible for one man to use other man's labour. Nor was there any sense in subjugating other people. But when man began to produce more than was necessary for his subsistence, it became possible to exploit him. As labour productivity grew further, this possibility became a reality. Slavery emerged, and society divided into the rich and the poor, the haves and the have-nots, the slave-owners and the slaves. *There appeared classes*. Primitive-communal society gave way to class society, namely, slave-owning society. The transition to class society accelerated the development of the productive forces. Slaves were forced to work 16-18 hours a day, which accounted for the rise in labour productivity. Wealth accrued, leading to flourishing exchange and trade and the sprouting of cities as centres of trade and crafts. Society became stratified, giving rise to groups of people who were not directly engaged in material production but spent all their time in different kinds of intellectual activity. This became an important prerequisite for the development of human culture and promoted the development of science, and hence production. Social progress was achieved due to the ruthless exploitation of the working people and their enslavement as a result of wars and plunder. A slave was fully a slave-owner's property. He had nothing—no property, no family, no home. For this reason he was not interested in raising labour productivity. The slave-owning system could therefore develop only within certain bounds and subsequently began to brake social progress. A more progressive system in the form of *feudal society* came to replace it.

Peasants personally dependent on land-owners constituted the main productive force under feudalism. Peasants were not free men either but they had homes, families, some implements and sometimes small plots of land. Therefore they had greater material interest, as compared with slaves, in earning the means of subsistence and, consequently, in raising labour productivity.

The substitution of serfdom for slavery promoted the further development of the productive forces and improvement of social relations. At the same time social development again came up against certain difficulties. For instance, as labour productivity grew and the amount of produce increased, the portion peasants had to give to feudals and all sorts of middlemen also grew. Peasants tried to resist this and to rid themselves from being subordinate to feudals. The latter forcibly restrained them, making all sorts of laws that meted out punishment for peasants for such kind of attempts. This in its turn led to new contradictions and even to peasant wars against the feudals. Feudal society was superseded by *capitalist* society as a result.

The contradictions of feudal society were to a certain extent resolved under capitalism and for this reason capitalist society was more progressive as compared with the preceding types of social organization. Workers became formally free and could no longer be bought or sold, to say nothing of being forcibly subordinated to anybody. But in order to exist, workers themselves have to sell their labour power and to get jobs at capitalist enterprises, where capitalists are owners and workers merely employees; capitalists hire workers not out of commiseration but in order to get profit because workers produce the surplus value; profits go to capitalists and curtailed wages to workers. As a result society's major riches produced by the working people are amassed in the hands of the capitalists. Therefore, despite the fact that there are relatively greater opportunities for the development of the productive forces, new grave contradictions immediately emerge. The main contradiction under capitalism is that between the social nature of labour and the private form of the appropriation of its results. People engage in joint work, while the bigger portion of their output is appropriated by the few.

Consequently, just as at the previous stages of social development there is injustice under capitalism, albeit not so obvious as in feudal society, but subtler and "masked" though just as cruel and unbearable.

This injustice is caused by the private ownership of the basic means of production. It is precisely the private ownership of the means of production, whatever its form, that gives the proprietor the right to take the surplus product produced by workers. It is private property that underpins private appropriation thriving under capitalism. But private property can be made public, and all means of production—factories, plants, the land, forests, rivers and so on—can be made the common property of all the people. Then the results of social labour can be distributed in the interests of the whole of society, which would eliminate exploitation of man by man, the prime injustice of a society built on private property. Public property makes it possible to rationally plan production on a nationwide scale and in the interests of the entire society and every man. This is possible only under socialism, the first stage of communist society.

What are the conclusions to be drawn from the foregoing?

To begin with, society comes into being of necessity, triggered by the need for the joint production of the means of subsistence. It is not a result of free "agreement", nor of a coordinated association of people. Society is an organization that is formed in accordance with the objective laws of production, particularly, in accordance with the needs for the development of the productive forces and for augmenting material benefits.

At a certain stage production development causes the emergence of private property. Though this circumstance serves human progress, it at the same time breeds a host of social contradictions.

As a result any society based on the private ownership of the means of production, irrespective of its development level, sooner or later arrives at such a state when it has of necessity to be replaced by a different society. *Society develops...* This was the conclusion Marx made, analyzing the objective logic of the emergence and development of production and social relations. Such is the actual history of the origin of human society and the logic of its development.

This is something the bourgeois philosophers cannot agree with, to say nothing of the proprietors themselves, the landlords and the capitalists! Herein lies the main root of all contradictions between the proponents of scientific sociology and diverse strains of bourgeois philosophic thought. All efforts of bourgeois ideologists aim at eradicating the idea that human progress and the production of material benefits are interdependent. Especially great efforts are made to conceal the fact that the private ownership of the means of production is the major obstacle on the road towards social progress and that it should be abolished to ensure the free development of man, implements of labour and the entire practice of social relations.

Their major aim is to prove that the institution of private property is unshakeable and to engrave in people's minds that nothing ever changes in society. The present state of affairs has always existed and should be maintained for ever.

In other words, the idea that *society develops* and that any changes are possible in it is denied in every way. But can we accept this?

Let us consider the problem of social development in greater detail.

## 2. Does Society Develop and What Underlies Its Development?

When discussing the origin of man and society, we saw that labour and material production had a decisive role to play in that process. Social labour formed the foundation for the emergence, organization and development of human society.

Bourgeois ideologists reject the development and especially the decisive role of production in social life, arguing that if society really develops of necessity and everywhere in accordance with the development of production, why has that development been uneven and why have there existed so many different types of society? Why was it that not all of them progressed to become, say, socialist societies?

There are indeed about 200 countries on our planet, among them some with elements of slavery and feudal relations, and others exemplifying capitalist or socialist society. Some countries are rightly considered as the cradle of human civilization and nevertheless, far from reaching their acme subsequently, are now in the state of decline. For instance, Egypt saw slavery come into being two millenia earlier than Greece, while other Asian and African countries never knew slavery in its classical form. In India and China the feudal mode of production existed for more than two millennia, while capitalism developed in Europe and in some countries was even replaced by socialism within that period of time.

The point, however, is that, though the production of material benefits forms the foundation of the development of any society, it in itself does not determine the rate of its development. Production develops in primitive-communal society, under slavery, feudalism, capitalism and socialism but the rates of its development are different under each system. To understand why production and following it the different types of society develop unevenly, it is necessary, first, to remember that the rates of social development are determined not merely by material production but by the *mode of production* of material benefits, and that not every mode of production stimulates social progress in equal measure. Second, besides the mode of production, which does play the decisive role, social progress and the rates of its development are determined by a set of other circumstances.

Let us first consider the mode of production as the foundation of social development.

## The Mode of Production as the Foundation of Social Development

*The mode of production is material production in a historically concrete form.* In other words, the mode of production is a historically concrete stage in the development of social production, a historically distinctive way of getting material benefits. Social production functions and evolves in the form of certain modes of production. Ever since mankind came into being several modes of production existed and replaced one another, among them the primitive-communal, slave-owning, feudal, capitalist and communist modes of production, with socialism being the first stage of the latter.

Every mode of production of material benefits represents a unity of its two aspects: *productive forces and production relations.*

*The productive forces consist of people with production experience, knowhow and skills, and the means of production, above all, tools and objects of labour.*

The productive forces reflect people's attitude to nature: the development level of the productive forces reflects the degree of man's control over nature.

*Production relations are the sum total of material and economic relations between people that develop in the course of production, distribution, exchange and consumption.*

The form of ownership is the main element of production relations, which determines their type.

The productive forces and production relations constantly interact—the productive forces affect production relations and the other way round. The question arises what is the essence of this interaction and what role it plays in social life?

Generally speaking, the mechanism of this interaction is quite simple. It has already been pointed out that the implements and the people themselves, their abilities, labour skills and professional knowledge constantly develop in the historical process. This development is determined by the people's imperfect relations with nature and their dissatisfaction with the position they occupy in the natural world, to be more precise, by the contradiction between the conditions they find themselves in and the goals they intend to attain. Wishing to improve their situation and to make life more comfortable, people improve their instruments of mastering nature and themselves advance in their development. At a certain stage they discover that not only their relations with nature are imperfect but that their relations with each other, that is, production relations are no better, too.

This leads to a contradiction between the level of their development as producers of material benefits and those relations that had been established way back when the people were less developed, less capable and less productive. The resolution of this contradiction results in replacing the entire aggregate of old and outdated production relations; the mode of people's vital activities, the mode of their participation in material production, to be more precise, the mode of production of material benefits changes too. As you see, contradictions between the productive forces and outdated production relations cause the replacement of the old mode of production by a new one and the transition from old society to a new one. This is to say that the dialectics of the productive forces and production relations is the source of the development of the modes of production and their succession, the source of social development, i. e. society develops.

This fails to get at the heart of the matter, however. The time when the old mode of production is replaced by a new one is also determined by the type of production relations and the nature of their effect on the productive forces. In this sense the dual nature of production relations should be taken into consideration: in some cases they can accelerate the development of the productive forces and in others, block their development.

Production relations promote the development of the productive forces if their nature corresponds to the nature and the level of development of the productive forces. This correspondence is ensured, however, only during the early period of the establishment of new production relations or only provided they are built on the basis of the public ownership of the means of production. With this form of property the economy is managed according to a single plan and primarily in the interests of man, the main productive force. For this reason production relations are regulated here so that they should guarantee the most favourable conditions for the development of the productive forces and hence so that they always should correspond to the latter's nature and development level. Incidentally, this largely explains the fact that in the socialist countries, provided no subjective miscalculations are made, the productive forces develop faster than in exploiter societies, and socialist societies develop at higher rates.

Otherwise old production relations hinder the development of the productive forces. This has to do, first, with the fact that by nature production relations constitute the more conservative aspect of the mode of production. As a rule they lag behind the developing productive forces and, consequently, brake them. Second, production relations based on private property never completely meet the needs of the development of the productive forces. What is more, they sharply clash with the interests of the development of the productive forces. Within the framework of such production relations the productive forces develop exceptionally slowly, advancing towards progress only by combatting existing production relations. They get ample opportunities for their development only when old production relations are broken and new ones established in the course of social revolutions. If, however, new production relations are again based on private property, the productive forces again have to fight against them. All this cannot but affect adversely the development of the productive forces.

Third, the development of the productive forces is even more hindered by production relations that have outlived themselves but are deliberately conservated by the exploiter classes. For instance, the present-day productive forces under capitalism have reached such a level of development that demands that old production relations be replaced by new ones. The capitalists not only obstruct this but are trying to impose these old relations upon other countries and nations that want to choose their own road of development.

Despite the fact that it is ever more difficult today to stage such attempts, the exploiters zealously persist in doing that. For this reason, though social progress is indeed connected with the objective process of the development of production and the productive forces, the process that underlies advancement of any society whatsoever, the rates of development of one particular society or another depend on the type of production relations dominant in it.

Sociologists have established that the varying development level of different countries is largely determined by the nature of production relations existing in them, particularly by exploiter relations.

The exploiter modes of production adversely affect social development not only in their own countries but also human progress in general. Thus the economic and social backwardness of some newly-free countries is caused by the colonialist policy of the imperialists. Their predatory system of exploiting not only their own peoples but also those in the colonial and dependent countries was the reason for those countries' inability to develop normally. It is common knowledge today that the economic difficulties experienced by some Asian, African and Latin American countries have been caused by inequitable cooperation the imperialists imposed on these countries.

The national liberation and democratic revolutions that are taking place in the world, crashing old exploiter relations, demonstrate that the mass of the working people long to see radical changes.

The national liberation revolutions are brought about by a profound contradiction between the needs of the development of the productive forces in these countries and extremely backward production relations.

The reactionaries and counter-revolutionaries both at home and abroad seek to re-establish in some of these countries old or slightly "revamped" exploiter production relations. The working people's actions against such attempts by the counter-revolutionaries in the newly-free countries attest that they will not put up with any sort of exploiter relations. The working people are not indifferent to what sort of production relations are to be established in new society because it is quite obvious that not all of them equally serve the interests of improving the people's life or the cause of social progress. Historical practice has shown that, just as the slave-owning mode of production was more efficient as compared with the primitive-communal one and the feudal mode of production as compared with the slave-owning one, the communist mode of production, whose foundations have been laid in socialist society, promotes progress to a larger extent, in an entirely new form and on an immeasurably larger scale than the capitalist mode of production.

What is the conclusion to be made from this fact?

According to Marx who saw it as extremely important: 1) If social life always depends on the production of material wealth and the character (type) of production relations, consequently, the productive activity and the material life of society always determine all other types of activity, including intellectual activity.

If we take into account the fact that material activity and the material life of society constitute its social being, while intellectual activity (ideological, political, legal and so on) forms part of social consciousness, it can be concluded that *social being always determines social consciousness*. Furthermore, if this dependence is objective and essential and repeats itself, it becomes a law. In this way Marx formulated the basic law of society: "*It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness*."[1] This approach to explaining society and history, namely, by recognizing the decisive role of material activity and material factors in the life of society and history, is a *materialist interpretation of society, a materialist interpretation of history*.

2) To ensure the development of society, it is necessary to meet one more condition – *production relations should correspond to the nature and level of development of the productive forces*.

This situation will give limitless opportunities for the development of the productive forces and for social progress. This is, therefore, another most important law of social development, and those who recognize it and follow its requirements adhere to the materialist approach to transforming society and explaining history.

3) The existence of laws of society means that its development is not submitted to anybody's will. The very fact of their existence is not affected by whether these laws are recognized or not. That is why the bourgeois ideologists find it ever more difficult to conceal this fact.

Unable to disprove the conclusions of dialectical materialism on this issue, the bourgeois ideologists seek to weaken at least to some extent the impression these conclusions produce on social consciousness and search out new arguments which, according to them, should refute the idea of the decisive role of the mode of production in social development and everything connected with it.

Among these arguments figure the concepts of the decisive role of the *natural environment and the demographic factor* in social development.

How does this affect our problem?

---

[1] K. Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 21 (italics mine.–*The Author*).

## 3. Natural Environment and Demographic Factor as Constant and Necessary Conditions of Social Development

Dependent on the mode of the production of material benefits, social development is also affected by some other circumstances. In particular, the process is greatly influenced by the natural environment, the demographic factor and the general readiness of the people to improve all their social relations and so on. How are these factors manifested?

### The Natural Environment and Its Role in Social Life

Social society emerged from nature and, though in its development it has estranged itself from nature to a certain extent, society still depends on it. We have already seen that this relation is above all manifest in the process of material production. As Marx put it: "Labour is, in the first place, a process in which both man and Nature participate, and in which man of his own accord starts, regulates, and controls the material re-actions between himself and Nature."[1] It should be noted, however, that the man interacts with only some part of Nature, the so-called natural environment. *The natural environment is that part of nature, which is in especially close interaction with society and is affected by it.* From the point of view of today's knowledge, the natural environment includes the Earth crust, solar energy, the atmosphere, waters, soils, the flora and fauna, the planet's magnetic field, gravitation and so on. For this reason the natural environment is not merely closely connected with society but constitutes an essential condition for and means of its existence. Bearing this in mind, bourgeois philosophers absolutize the role played by the natural environment and try to depict the entire process of social development as dependent on it, presenting it as responsible for both successes and failures of the peoples. In so doing they speculate on the misconceptions of the issue that were current way back among ancient philosophers. Indeed, the effect of the natural environment on the destinies of the peoples was discussed by Herodotus (490-425 B.C.), Aristotle and others. Aristotle, for instance, believed that the climate and the geographical conditions affected both the political system and the intellectual abilities of the people. He wrote that the people of the North possessed colossal courage but were poor as far as their mental and artistic abilities were concerned and explained this by the cold climate they lived in. The Asian peoples, though endowed with intellectual potential, were deprived of daring. Under capitalism this view of the role of the natural environment developed into a representative sociological trend. The French philosopher, Montesquieu (1689-1755), the English historian, Buckle (1821-1862), the French geographer, Reclus (1830-1905) and others sought to explain the differences in the social system and the history of certain peoples by the influence exercized by the natural conditions they lived in, namely, the southerners were portrayed as lazy, the northerners as industrious, and so on. Hence allegedly the differences in the social organization and the level of life attained. In the 19th and 20th centuries geographical determinism acquired a reactionary nature. The German geographer and ethnographer Ratzel (1844-1904) set forth the idea of the struggle for Lebensraum as the driving force in history. Ratzel's conclusion laid the foundations of the reactionary theory of *geopolitics* that justified the imperialist seizure of other people's territories.

---

[1] K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, 1974, p. 173.

Dialectical materialism does not deny the role of the natural environment in social development. As an external factor of the social system, the natural environment indeed exercizes considerable influence on the development of the productive forces, the location of different national economic branches, the social division of labour and so on. Favourable geographical conditions in one country or another, the presence of mineral resources, fertile soils, diverse fauna and flora and a healthy climate speed up the development of society. The process is, on the contrary, slowed down by the unfavourable conditions of the natural environment. But this influence is not decisive in social development because society has the inner logic of development and can alter geographical conditions to its own advantage. That neither the natural environment, nor the geographical conditions are of decisive importance in social development but precisely the mode of production of material wealth is attested by the fact that countries with similar geographical and climatic conditions are at different development levels. For instance, the Soviet Central Asian republics, which border on Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan and India and have approximately similar natural conditions, have outstripped these countries in their economic development, though prior to the establishment of Soviet rule they were at a low development level.

The same is true of the demographic factor.

## The Demographic Factor and Its Role in Social Life

Bourgeois sociologists try to prove that the situation of the working people and the level of social development are determined not by the development of the productive forces nor the social conditions within one social system or another but by the "eternal" laws of nature that account for the fact that the growth of the means of subsistence lags behind population growth. For instance, the English economist, Thomas Malthus (1766-1834), the founder of the unscientific concept of Malthusianism, claimed that unemployment and indigence of the working people under capitalism was the result of the "absolute excess of people" and the action of the "natural demographic law". To ensure the successful development of society, it is necessary to think about the number of people, the population, corresponding to the means of subsistence rather than of the development of production. According to Malthus this correspondence could be ensured only with the help of epidemics, famine, wars and back-breaking work.

Modern Neo-Malthusian theorists, including Gaston Bouthoul, Houston Stewart Chamberlain and William Vogt, also believe that the social and economic backwardness of, say, the emergent countries is caused by high birth rates there rather than by the colonialist policy of imperialism. To overcome this backwardness it is necessary to cut the birthrate there. As this is not so easy to accomplish, the Neo-Malthusians opine that forcible measures should be used, namely, no medical care should be given to children born in excess of the fixed norm or the families with more children than is specified by the law should not be helped. They also pin their hopes on the atomic bomb in "saving civilization" from "unwanted mouths".

Dialectical materialism does not deny that the demographic factor has a role to play in social development. Indeed, social production can function effectively only provided there are a certain number of people and a certain combination of their physical and intellectual abilities. Population growth entails expansion of the productive forces of society and, consequently, its economic and political system also changes.

On the other hand the high density of the population, which calls for large material resources for its existence and which for this reason limits the possibilities for the development of social needs and production potential of the people, is not always highly instrumental in the flourishing of society. However, no matter how great the role of the demographic factor in the life of society and its development, like the natural environment, it is not a decisive condition of social progress. The experience of the capitalist countries and especially that of the socialist countries shows that the number of the population and demographic processes themselves depend on production. A fairly effective mode of production creates favourable conditions for the development of the material and intellectual requirements of the people. In its turn, this influences family and social relations, including birth rate and other demographic processes. For example, under socialism society concerns itself with the younger generation and faces no problem of "unwanted mouths to feed".

That is why the backwardness of certain countries as compared with other countries is primarily caused not by these natural factors but by preponderant economic relations both within society and between different societies. If one class or state is exploited by another the development of these societies is slowed down, irrespective of the conditions they are in, or the density of their populations. For instance, the colonial and dependent Asian, African and Latin American countries lag behind in their social and economic development not because they have unfavourable geographical conditions or high birth rates but mainly because for centuries they have been mercilessly exploited both by local proprietors and imperialist states. And conversely, the downfall of the colonial system enabled many an emergent state to achieve higher development rates. Aware of this, the peoples of the newly-free countries step up their struggle against neocolonialism and come out with increasing resolution against the exploiter regimes and exploiters in their countries, and embark upon the socialist road of development.

Let us recapitulate the foregoing.

Man and society are part of nature and its product and, though they do interact with it, they are not subordinate to it nor identical to it.

Society constantly improves its means of production and on this basis man himself and also relations that take shape among people in the process of labour. As these relations obey the objective laws of production, society must develop according to its own laws different from the laws of nature. It is incorrect therefore to picture social development as dependent on natural factors and to deduce the laws of social development from the laws of nature.

Consequently, neither the natural environment nor the demographic factor can be viewed as of decisive importance for social development. It is the mode of production that exercises this influence. The development of the mode of production ensures the development of society. As the limitless possibilities for the development of the productive forces are produced not by any mode of production but by the communist mode of production alone, all the imperfect modes of production (based on private property) are shattered through social revolutions and replaced by new ones. This goes on until the productive forces reach in their development the communist mode of production, which gives boundless opportunities for the development of the productive forces and for improving production relations.

*Test Questions*

1. What is society and how did it appear?
2. Is society developing and what is the foundation of social development?
3. What is natural environment and what role does it play in the development of society?
4. What is the role played by demographic factor in social life?

*Chapter VIII*

# TYPES OF SOCIETY AND THE LAWS OF THEIR SUCCESSION

The history of human society is a complicated and multifaceted process. Empires and states form, flourish and crumble. In different countries and at different times, periods of relatively tranquil development give way to revolutionary outbursts. The social image of the globe is changing in front of our own eyes. The past few decades alone have seen the emergence of dozens of new states on the ruins of many colonial systems. All this is the result of the constant development of the productive forces and production relations and the succession of the modes of production. At the same time human history does not boil down to continual changes and *unceasing* development but presupposes relative stability and the steady functioning of individual societies. Hence the logic of the historical process is seen as the unity of uninterrupted and interrupted development and is manifest in the unity and diversity of this process. The unity of history is to a decisive extent determined by the logic of the development of the productive forces, and the continuity of science, culture and arts. The diversity of the historical process is largely connected with the change of production relations, which determine other social relationships. As a rule, bourgeois sociologists absolutize this aspect of diversity and deny the unity of the historical process. According to them, history consists of numerous trends—civilizations, which are in no way interrelated. History, however, shows that, for all the diversity of social development, it also displays certain unity, which is expressed in that numerous countries have the same type of society. How is this unity manifest then and what distinguishes one society from another? What types of society exist?

To be able to answer these and many other questions arising in this connection, it is necessary to analyze in detail the fundamentals of the organization of society and its structure.

## 1. Types of Society, the Nature and Rates of Their Development

It was already mentioned earlier that society should be seen as made up of people, their material activity and those relations that take shape among them in exchanging that activity or in other types of intercourse. This definition refers to society in general, so to speak. Meanwhile there exists only concrete, historically given society. Every stage of the people's material activity has corresponding social relations and corresponding society. Marx called any such concretely given society a *socio-economic formation.*[1]

### The Concept of Socio-Economic Formation. Types of Society

*The socio-economic formation is a certain type of society determined by a concretely given mode of production.*

The socio-economic formation is the sum total of all social relations that take shape on the basis of a given type of production.

If we try to picture the structure, content and form of all these relations and to determine, so to speak, the "anatomy" of the socio-economic formation, it will look as follows:

At the basis there is a mode of production of material benefits, i. e. the productive forces and production relations.

The next essential structural element of the socio-economic formation is *relations of government* or *self-government* (for a future communist society). Relations of government include *political relations*, that is, relations between classes, nations, and also *the state.* Above relations of government are the so-called relations of *community*—legal and moral relations. Philosophical relations, relations connected with the nature of culture (aesthetic relations), religious relations and so on form an important part of the socio-economic formation.

The socio-economic formation also includes language, literature, science, relations between clans, tribes, nationalities and nations, family relations, relations between individuals, etc. All these elements are closely interrelated and, what is more, some of them are the same in many formations. It is therefore understandable that the nature of the above-mentioned elements of the socio-economic formation at different stages and in different countries can be most diverse. How then can we distinguish one socio-economic formation from another or determine which type of society we deal with? How should this intricate intertwinement of countless relations be interpreted and what should be chosen as the basis for their classification?

---

[1] Karl Marx and Frederick Engles, "Articles from the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, March 6-May 19, 1849. Wage Labour and Capital", in: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, 1977, p. 212.

To find one's bearings in this diversity and to be able to establish a natural interdependence between all types of social relations and to determine the type of society on this basis, it is necessary, above all, to single out *primary*, fundamental relations and then *derivative* relations. When we know what relations are primary and what secondary, we can compare them with similar relations in another society and to establish in what respect they are similar or different. If their main aspects coincide, the societies under consideration belong to the same type.

This was the approach adopted by Marx. Proceeding from the fact that material production plays the principal role in the life of society, he, to quote Lenin, concluded that *material*, production relations were of paramount importance in the system of entire social relations. All the rest were derivative relations that depended on material relations and were relations of *ideology*.[1]

Indeed, scientific analysis and the entire historical practice show that production relations, as an aspect of the mode of production and, consequently, an essential condition for the existence of society, are the most important and most essential relations. They constitute, as it were, the first "layer" of social relations and underpin the entire superstructure of all other social relations.

Because of the role production relations play in the system of social relations they are called basic relations or simply the *basis*. Ideological relations, consequently, form the second "layer" in the system of social relations and act as a superstructure above the basis. Hence they are called the *superstructure*. Therefore the basis determines the entire system of relations of the superstructure. The nature of the superstructure is directly dependent on the nature of the basis. For instance, the feudal superstructure, that is, the feudal state, culture, morals and so on, corresponds to feudal production relations; the capitalist basis has the corresponding capitalist superstructure.

Analysis of material social relations makes it possible to observe some recurrent elements of society and social relations and to generalize the systems observed in different countries in one basic concept of the *socio-economic formation*. This generalization made it possible to pass from describing social phenomena to their strictly scientific analysis. The history of human society knows five modes of production and five types of production relations. In keeping with this there are five types of socio-economic formations, five types of society, including *primitive-communal, slave-owning, feudal, capitalist, and communist societies*, with socialist society constituting the first stage of the latter. The change of the mode of production entails a change of production relations and, consequently, a change of the socio-economic formation, the replacement of one type of society by another. However, replacement of one society by another is determined not only by the change in production relations and the economic basis but also by the ideological superstructure. As a result, the process of social development, the replacement of one socio-economic formation by another is a complicated interaction of, on the one hand, the productive forces and production relations on the basis of the law requiring correspondence between the nature of the latter and the level of the development of the productive forces and, on the other, the interaction of the basis and the superstructure in keeping with *the law of correspondence between the basis and the superstructure*. We have already discussed the essence of the first law. The second law operates in keeping with the following mechanism.

---

[1] See V. I. Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats", *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, pp. 137-38.

## Interaction Between the Basis and the Superstructure as a Source and Law of the Succession of Societies

As every formation is characterized by its own type of production relations, which form *the basis* of society, and by the *superstructure* corresponding to that basis, these two are in the state of close dialectical interaction. The basis is the determining aspect with regards to the superstructure, since production relations depend on the development of the productive forces and social production, which is central for social development. Lenin pointed out that "just as material causes underlie all natural phenomena, so the development of human society is conditioned by the development of material forces, the productive forces".[1] Indeed, phenomena pertaining to the superstructure cannot be understood in isolation from production relations. For instance, legal rules always formalize and reproduce the form of ownership existing in a given society and for this reason cannot be interpreted in their own terms. According to Marx, "your jurisprudence is but the will of your class made into a law for all...".[2] With the help of law the ruling class enforces the system of relations meeting its interests.

Similarly, the nature of policy also depends on the nature of production relations. This is quite understandable because policy is a concentrated expression of the economy, that is, of the sum total of the economic interests of the ruling class. Thus, it is the basis relations that prove to be of decisive importance in the entire system of social relations. To establish just social relations that would preclude exploitation, enslavement, inequality and so on, it is necessary to transform first and foremost the basis, production relations, i. e. relations of ownership, distribution, exchange and consumption. When bourgeois ideologists and the bourgeoisie itself claim that it is enough for these purposes to raise production efficiency, to amend social ideals and laws, and so on, they should not be taken seriously. It is impossible to substitute the technological basis for the economic basis, just as it is impossible to pass relations of the superstructure for the decisive element in social development. Production development in capitalist society and the improvement of bourgeois policy, law, ideology and so on only cater to the needs of the ruling classes. It is therefore natural that all their proposals aim at leading human thought away from the most essential issue for them, that of perpetuating private property and their economic sway.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "Frederick Engels", *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, Moscow, 1977, p. 21.

[2] Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, "Manifesto of the Communist Party", *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, Moscow, 1976, p. 501.

That is why the countries, where proletarian or national democratic revolutions take place, attach prime importance to transforming above all economic, production relations by limiting and abolishing the private ownership of the means of production and changing the order of distribution, exchange and consumption in society.

What then are the functions of the superstructure? Do the state, law and ideas play no role at all in society? If they are not of decisive importance, why should the working people struggle to gain political power and to establish proletarian ideology and law? Dialectical materialism does not deny that the superstructure does have a role to play in social development, in the replacement of one type of society by another. As a matter of fact, though the basis indeed conditions the superstructure, the latter is in no way a passive appendix to it, but plays an active role with respect to the basis. The function of the superstructure consists in promoting the development of its own basis, consolidating the economic system, regulating its functioning and eliminating the vestiges of the old basis. Though it is not directly linked with production, the superstructure affects production via the economic basis. Describing the state as a political superstructure, Engels spoke about the threefold influence the superstucture exercises upon the economic development: "It can run in the same direction, and then development is more rapid; it can oppose the line of development in which case ... it will go to pieces in the long run in every great people; or it can prevent the economic development from proceeding along certain lines, and prescribe other lines. This case ultimately reduces itself to one of the two previous ones. But it is obvious that in cases two and three political power can do great damage to the economic development and cause a great squandering of energy and material."[1] Keeping this in mind, the communist and workers' parties attach great importance to improving and transforming the social superstructure and to using its institutes and bodies to consolidate the foundation of the social system.

Viewing the conditions in the newly-free countries in the light of the foregoing, we can make the following conclusion. These countries will be a success in eliminating exploiter economic relations and building new social relations only provided the working people retain political power. They have to defend their rule, to use it to establish new economic relations, to develop all other elements of the superstructure, their own law, ideology and culture, and to strengthen bodies that serve to promote new production relations. As legal norms, political, ideological and other views of the formerly oppressed nations are often not very mature, they have to rely in this on other peoples' help and sometimes even borrow from the working people of other countries, all the more so since the interests and hence political, legal and ideological views of the working people, no matter what country they live in, are international by nature. In this way Marxist-Leninist ideology expresses the interests of the working people throughout the world and for this reason it is international ideology. That is why the working people of all countries should be guided by this ideology and the developing countries should use it to enlighten their people.

Bourgeois ideologists seek to frighten the developing nations with allegations that, once they establish the new socialist superstructure, they can lose their culture, national and religious traditions, morality, etc. This is a falsehood, however. First, the establishment of the socialist superstructure does not change culture as a whole but eradicates only its reactionary and outdated elements, some norms of bourgeois morality, nationalism and so on. Second, the socialist superstructure ensures conditions that, on the contrary, promote the development of national culture and place it within the reach of every member of society. If something of old culture disappears after all, this is merely caused by the requirements of the objective laws of the development of production and the economic basis, which cannot be ignored without doing damage to society.

As you see, the development of society is a complicated process of the *interaction* of the productive forces and production relations, and of production relations (the economic basis) and the superstructure.

---

[1] "Engels to C. Schmidt in Berlin, October 27, 1890", in: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, 1976, pp. 491-92.

## The Nature and Rates of Historical Development

All socio-economic formations differ in the nature of their production relations, the basis and the superstructure. Consequently, the nature of the interaction between the productive forces and production relations, the basis and the superstructure is also different. The laws of the conformity of production relations to the nature and the level of development of the productive forces and of correspondence between the superstructure and the basis are met to different extents. As a result in different formations historical development proceeds in a different way.

Prior to socialism development was antagonistic by nature in all the formations. First, it is only at the early stages of the establishment of new production relations that they correspond to the level and nature of development of the productive forces. During this period development is vigorous, social production expands considerably and large-sclae progress is seen in all or almost all fields of life. Later on, as production relations begin to lag behind the productive forces and exploiter societies enforce production relations in the form they were initially set up instead of improving them in essence, development slows down, leading to stagnation and even regress in many aspects of life. Second, even if progressive changes were and are carried out there, they serve the interests of the rich and are to the detriment of the interests of the working people. Describing the exploiter socio-economic formations, Engels wrote: "Since the exploitation of one class by another is the basis of civilisation, its whole development moves in a continuous contradiction. Every advance in production is at the same time a retrogression in the condition of the oppressed class, that is, of the great majority. What is a boon for the one is necessarily a bane for the other; each new emancipation of one class always means a new oppression of another class."[1] Indeed, though transition from the primitive-communal system to slavery spelt progress in the development of technology and the productive forces, the slave-owning system was only progressive up to a certain point. The ruthless exploitation of man by man began soon to obstruct progress, resulting subsequently in numerous slave uprisings.

Needless to say, the replacement of the slave-owning formation by feudalism was a progressive step in social development. But here, too, contradictions soon surfaced that stood in the way of social progress. Under capitalism the development of the productive forces and social production fails to improve the situation of the working people either and is therefore constantly hamstrung by capitalist production relations. If certain progress is still observed, it is only the bourgeoisie who stand to gain from it because this progress is attained by it through the oppression and merciless exploitation of the working people.

---

[1] Frederick Engels, "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State", in: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 333.

Another characteristic feature of progress under capitalism is that it is made by enslaving other countries and nations with the help of the policy of colonialism and neocolonialism in our day. The history of colonial conquest offers ample material attesting to the anti-progressive essence of colonialism. True, colonial countries saw some development in the material and cultural fields but this development was not progressive in the overall social context. Progressive bourgeois historian Jean Chesneaux pointed out that the innovations of the colonial regime were introduced for its direct benefit and had to do only with those sectors of production and social life where they were necessary for its better functioning. Far from ensuring social progress in production or in the development of the living standards, which is something the colonial regime is not interested in, these innovations, on the contrary, obstruct general progress. Prof. Josué de Castro of Brazil, who is President of the Association Mondiale de Lutte Contre la Faim bitterly remarked that the colonial world had turned into the kingdom of starvation and misery thanks to the "concern" of the colonialists.

Under socialism social development proceeds in a different way. Marx, Engels and Lenin showed that true progress of humanity starts only when society based on exploitation of man by man is destroyed in the course of history. Engels pointed out that the building of new society "will date a new epoch of history, in which mankind itself, and with mankind all branches of its activity ... will experience an advance that will put everything preceding it in the deepest shade".[1]

Lenin also said that only under socialism a genuinely, rapid forward movement will begin in all spheres of public and private life.[2]

Historical experience in the past fifty years or so fully corroborated these ideas of the founders of Marxism-Leninism and proved that in all countries, irrespective of the starting point of their economic development level, the size of their territories and populations, genuine progress can be ensured only on the road to socialism.

Under socialism, production relations and the social superstructure promote the development of the productive forces and the improvement of the rest of social relations in the utmost degree. This means that social production here is developed not in the interests of a handful of the select but in the interests of the working people, who are directly engaged in producing the material wealth. For the first time ever society arrives at such a state when man himself becomes the main value. As a result all members of society become interested in developing production at high rates and in constantly raising labour productivity.

---

[1] Frederick Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 35.

[2] See V. I. Lenin, "The State and Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, Moscow, 1977, p. 477.

Under socialism and communism therefore development is radically different from what it was prior to this formation. It proceeds at a steady rate and for the first time in history ensures that gaps be bridged in the economic and cultural development of both individual members of society and nations forming part of the socialist community or one socialist country or another.

## 2. Social Development as a Natural Historical Process

What was said earlier about the sources and factors of social development, particularly about the development of the productive forces, production relations and the superstructure, allows for the conclusion that society indeed develops and that this development is an objective process. Bourgeois philosophers, however, try to dispute in every possible way that social development is a natural historical process. They argue there are no laws of development, including those of social development. For this reason, in expounding their views of society, dialectical materialists pay foremost attention to an in-depth analysis of the essence of the laws of social development. In particular it is important to elucidate the difference between the laws of society and the laws of nature and its significance for man's practical activity.

The laws of society differ from the laws of nature in that they are manifest in people's activity. They do not exist outside people's activity or outside society. People themselves make their history, of course, on the basis of the material and spiritual prerequisites they inherited from the preceding generations. Social laws, whose operation is seen as tendencies, determine the main course of development, without excluding chance events and deviations, through which necessity paves the way. Social laws are objective because they exist independently from the mind and people cannot ignore them. Take, for instance, the law of value. It begins to act only when people enter relations of sale-and-purchase and requires that the price of a commodity was not less than the cost of the socially necessary labour inputs made by the worker to produce the given goods and to sustain himself as a worker. If goods are sold at a lower price, the worker will be ruined and will cease to exist as a producer of the given commodity. Consequently, it is impossible to ignore the requirements of this law, for it operates irrespective of our wishes. This law is objective; the same is true of other social laws.

The specificity of social laws consists in that they are of temporal nature and vary over the period of their operation. Some laws operate throughout the history of human society. Among these are general sociological laws, for example, the law of the correspondence of production relations to the nature and development level of the productive forces and the law of the primacy of social being and the secondary nature of social consciousness. Some laws operate within the framework of only one or several socio-economic formations. The laws of class struggle are inherent in such socio-economic formations whose economic foundation rests on the private ownership of the means of production; the law of producing and appropriating surplus value is the main economic law of capitalism; the law of the balanced development of all aspects of social life operates only in the communist formation, that is, under socialism and communism, and so on.

This circumstance makes it easier to undestand why the processes of social development proceed differently in different socio-economic formations. The higher the level of social development, the more consummate its organization, the greater the extent to which the objective requirements of social laws are manifest and the greater the degree of the conformity of the people's activity to the requirements of these laws. Knowledge of the laws of social development enables the people to use them in their activities and, under socialism, serves as the basis for working out a scientifically substantiated policy and social forecast. It opens up wide prospects for the development of the productive forces, the growth of social production and the improvement of all other social relations, which guarantees the high rates of social progress. Conversely, if the requirements of objective laws are ignored or people act counter to them, the development of society is fettered and its progress deliberately restrained. Small wonder, therefore, that it takes much more time for the exploiter societies to attain certain progress.

In this connection the problem of social progress has become especially acute in the developing countries, which have to choose their own road. Indeed, if social development is a natural process, which cannot be changed at will or ignored, is it legitimate to raise the problem of choosing some road or of building society in keeping with pre-set goal? Wouldn't it be better to count on the "natural" course of development and wait till society flourishes in a natural way? It is an appropriate question. Indeed, the history of human society is a natural historical process, which cannot be accelerated or "outstripped", just as it is impossible to ignore the requirements of objective conditions. This means that it is impossible to pass from, say, a primitive-communal society to communist society. Slave-owning society cannot be transformed into capitalist society without developing the productive forces, etc. Such a transition is precluded, as a rule, by the underdeveloped productive forces, including man, and underdeveloped public organiztions, bodies and institutes. In other words, society is unable to step to a higher level because it lacks the corresponding material and cultural prerequisites and the objective and subjective factors are not ripe yet. Therefore to attain progress, society has but one road: to develop constantly the productive forces and man as the main productive force, and to improve and develop all social relations. This is precisely the course of the development of human history. That is why sooner or later all nations, irrespective of the level of their development today, will come to the best mode of social life, to communism.

But does this mean that no effort should be made to attain this goal? Historical laws do not exist outside people's activities and, on the contrary, are manifest in them. People themselves make their history. Social laws determine only the main course of development, without previsaging a host of chance events and deviations, through which historical necessity paves the way. The rest depends on the people themselves. This means that more favourable external conditions, say, more favourable natural environment, national traditions and so on, may enable some peoples to cover this *general* path of development in a way different from others. For instance, the Slavonic peoples and the nomads of Asia and Africa bypassed the slave-owning formation in their development and advanced from the primitive-communal system to feudalism, while America and Canada knew no feudalism. Soviet Republics in Central Asia came to socialism, bypassing not only the stage of mature feudalism, but that of capitalism as well.

The developing countries have especially favourable conditions for such "leaps" now that there is the socialist system, which can give them practical economic and other assitance. This is forcefully borne out by the socio-economic achievements made by Algeria, Angola, the Congo, Ethiopia, Mozambique, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and other countries, which enjoy extensive aid from the USSR and other socialist countries. As you see, one nation or another should not necessarily go in its development through all socio-economic formations without exception. On the contrary, if one nation or another shows high socio-political activity in its development and if its leaders draw on scientific Marxist-Leninist sociology, it can prepare and produce objective prerequisites so as to exclude capitalism, which is the most onerous stage in going forward, and to pass to socialism.

In one of his letters to Russian revolutionaries Engels wrote: "It is not only possible but inescapable that once the proletariat wins out and the means of production pass into common ownership among the West-European nations, the countries ... where tribal institutions or relics of them are still intact, will be able to use these relics of communal ownership and the corresponding popular customs as a powerful means of considerably shortening their advance to socialist society and largely sparing themselves the sufferings and the struggles through which we in Western Europe have to make our way... And this applies not only to Russia but to all countries at the pre-capitalist stage of development."[1] Lenin shared this view. He wrote: "Are we to consider as correct the assertion that the capitalist stage of economic development is inevitable for backward nations now on the road to emancipation and among whom ... advance towards progress is to be seen...? We replied in the negative. If the victorious revolutionary proletariat conducts systematic propaganda among them, and the Soviet governments come to their aid with all the means at their disposal—in that event it will be mistaken to assume that the backward peoples must inevitably go through the capitalist stage of development."[2] This is well understood by progressive leaders in some newly-free states. Sometimes the question is asked whether it is possible to pass directly to communism. No, it is not possible because only those formations can be skipped that have exhausted themselves historically and became obsolete. After all, it is no mere chance that the majority of mankind has passed through all these major stages of history in its development. This furnishes us with another confirmation that a natural historical process as an objective process is not subject to man's will.

Some leaders of emergent states entertain idle ideas to the effect that there exists some "third" road of social development. In fact, both theoretically and practically, we can only speak about some favourable conditions that produce prerequisites for transition to a higher level of social development, bypassing obsolete forms of social relations. The idea of a "third" road is in every way supported and developed by bourgeois sociologists when some newly-free country renounces the capitalist road of development and is faced with an option of development along socialist lines. Under the circumstances bourgeois sociologists believe that the "third" road is the only "way of saving" such a country from communism. They strive to push the newly-free states onto that "road", though it is becoming ever more difficult and sometimes even impossible for them to achieve this. Ever more leaders of the emergent states come to recognize that the developing nations can do away with their plight and backwardness only by embarking on the road of building socialism.

---

[1] Frederick Engels, "On Social Relations in Russia", in: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 2, pp. 401-02.

[2] V. I. Lenin, "The Second Congress of the Communist International, July 19-August 7, 1920. Report of the Commission on the National and the Colonial Questions, July 26", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, Moscow, 1974, p. 244.

Such is in most general terms the dialectical materialist concept of social development as a natural historical process. Let us sum up what has been discussed in this chapter.

Human society is constantly developing, the process which is seen as the unity of the discrete and the continuous. Certain types of society, socio-economic formations, correspond to periods of relative stability. The development and succession of the socio-economic formations are determined by the operation of social laws, general and special, basic and non-basic. Transition from one formation to another is a process of going up from the lower levels of development to the higher ones, while formations in this sense constitute, as it were, stages of social progress.

Taking into consideration the fact that not all the formations produce the necessary conditions for high rates of social progress and, what is more, it is hindered in the antagonistic formations, the revolutionary energy of the people is directed at breaking old, obsolete exploiter production relations and at replacing the exploiter types of society by new production relations and a new, socialist type of society. This process is far from being easy, however. All the stages of social development call for the high social activity of the mass of the people. Though historical progress takes place of necessity, its rates are determined by the conscious activity of the broad mass of the people, who are the subjects, the makers of history. They have to be able to assess correctly all the real factors of the existing situation and to display sufficient flexibility in making use of the requirements of the objective laws.

## *Test Questions*

1. What is a socio-economic formation?
2. What is the basis and what is the superstructure, and how do they interact?
3. What forms of historical development do you know?
4. What laws of social development do you know and in what way do they differ from the laws of nature?
5. How do you understand the natural historical process?

*Chapter IX*

# CLASSES AND CLASS RELATIONS

Classes and class relations constitute a problem that is highly relevant today.

On the one hand, the comprehension of this problem gives an insight into the mechanism of the laws of social development because classes and class relations are closely connected with social production and material relations. Historical acts are made according to the classes which take part in them, the role they play in social production and the way relations between them are regulated. Furthermore, the class struggle is a source from which antagonistic socio-economic formations develop.

On the other hand, the correct interpretation of the problem of classes and class relations is of tremendous importance in understanding any social processes in the world. It is impossible to give a scientific analysis of any significant phenomenon or event in the world without being guided by the theory of classes and class struggle. This is because all social processes in the world are in the interests of certain classes. The nature of a social phenomenon and the ways and forms in which it is carried out (or takes place) depend on whose class interests are being satisfied or encroached upon.

In this context scientific sociology insists that class approach should be a key requirement not only in any research but in social practice as well. This is especially important to those countries, which are the scene of acute class struggle for human progress and in which problems of class relations constitute the main content of everyday life.

What are classes? How did they come into being? Which classes oppose each other and why? What class should any honest, fair and humane citizen of any country side with? Who opposes the division of society into classes and why? These are the questions that today interest millions of people in the developing countries. Man's class position is largely determined by how he answers these questions.

It is dialectical materialism that offers correct answers to these questions. Let us briefly analyze their essence.

## 1. What Are Classes and How Were They Formed?

The term "class" comes from the Latin word *classis*, meaning type. Later on the term "class" gained wide currency and began to denote big groups of people, into which society divided.

Now can any big group of people be regarded as a class? One often hears the terms "the working class", "the class of peasants", "the class of feudal lords", and the "class of the bourgeoisie". These big groups of people are indeed classes. But there are also other big groups, say, nomads, doctors, teachers, and so on. Can they be regarded as classes?

Many scholars sought in vain to define the concept of "class" and to find a yardstick, which would help determine which groups of people are called classes and which are not, even though the division of society into classes and the struggle between them had long been an object of study.

Some researchers put forth the difference in people's mental abilities as an explanation of the division of society into classes. In their opinion, the groups that were more gifted, active and apt at performing the leading functions formed the ruling classes. The backward, dull and passive ones made up the oppressed classes. However, reality and history showed that these ideas were groundless. One often came across ignoramuses and mediocrities among the representatives of the ruling classes, while at the same time the oppressed classes produced talented people with most diverse abilities.

Other researchers attempted to take the difference in income and property status as the criterion for class division, for there is indeed an enormous gap in the incomes of the ruling classes and those of the oppressed classes. But then what determines this difference in incomes and why are the ruling classes rich and the representatives of the oppressed classes poor?

To conceal the true reasons behind the emergence of classes and to gloss over profound social differences between them, bourgeois sociologists develop diverse unscientific theories of the origin of classes. These include the "theory of violence", the theory of distribution, the technical-organizational theory, the theory of "social stratification", and also biological, psychological and other concepts. The "theory of violence", for instance, claims that one should look for the reasons for the emergence of classes not in the economy but in violence and the subjugation of some people or nations by others. The so-called "distribution" theory proceeds from the fact that the inequality in the distribution of incomes underlies the people's division into classes. Eliminate this difference in income—and classes will disappear. They also argue that capitalism has already put an end to the division of society into classes. Far from explaining the origin of classes, however, such theorists evade the problem. After all violence, even though it can replace one owner by another, is unable to create private property *per se*, as it is used only when there is something to be taken away. Consequently, it could hardly have led to the emergence of classes. Similarly, inequality in distribution appears only when there is something to be distributed and therefore cannot be the reason for the division of society into classes.

It was only Marx and Engels who managed to find the truly scientific solution to the problem. They showed that the appearance of classes and the yardsticks determining the distinction between one class or another have to do with the development of material production. In particular, they proved that the division of society into classes is connected only with certain historical stages in the development of production and that private ownership of the means of production lies at the heart of this division.

At the dawn of human civilization, in primitive society, people could produce only the bare minimum of resources necessary for sustenance. No accumulation of riches was possible under the circumstances. That is why primitive-communal society knew no economic inequality and was not divided into classes. Later on, when the production skills of the workers grew and it became possible to produce the surplus product and to appropriate it as private property, society gradually divided into the rich and the poor, the slave-owners and the slaves, the feudal lords and the serfs, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, that is, into certain classes. Classes formed in two ways, namely, by the isolation of the exploiter top echelon, which originally consisted of the elite, within a community and by turning the captives and later on the impoverished fellow tribemen, who sold themselves into bondage, into slaves. These were the two aspects of one and the same process, which led to the emergence of society divided into classes out of primitive-communal society.

Furthermore, the formation of classes has to do with the development of the social division of labour. The earliest major social division of labour, as we already know, was connected with the isolation of stock raising tribes from the rest of the people, which resulted in the exchange of products of labour between the cattle-breeders and the farmers, in the growth of public wealth and in the even more extensive use of slave labour.

Another major social division of labour had to do with the separation of crafts from farming, which also promoted the development of exchange and economic inequality and hence the division of people into classes.

The subsequent development of the social division of labour led to the separation of mental work from manual work and to turning the former into the monopoly of the ruling classes. Thus classes appeared as a result of the development of material production, which led to the appearance of private property and to the division of people into special, economically heterogeneous groups. The existence of classes therefore is connected with certain historical stages in the development of production, including the social division of labour. Placed into different economic conditions, the classes gradually develop different ideological, political, social, psychological, behavioral and other characteristics. The economic characteristics are the most important among them. That is why Lenin gave the following definition of classes in his work *A Great Beginning*: "Classes are large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most cases fixed and formulated in law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organization of labour and, consequently, by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it."[1]

In his definition Lenin singles out four features that distinguish classes from each other: 1) the place they occupy in a historically definite system of social production; 2) their relation to the means of production; 3) their role, in the social organization of labour; 4) the dimensions of their share of social wealth and the mode of acquiring it.

The main characteristic of a class among these four is the relation of classes to, the means of production. It is the ownership of the means of production that turns a given social group of people into a ruling class with some privileges. Alienation from the means of production turns a group of people into an oppressed class, whose lot is misery and lack of rights. In the same way the entire sum total of other objective factors and prerequisites pointed out by Lenin separates groups of people into classes. If we return to the question whether any big group can be considered a class, the answer would most certainly be in the negative. Neither the nomads, nor the teachers, nor the doctors, etc., take direct part in social production. The dimensions of the share of social wealth which they get and the mode of acquiring it are to a lesser extent connected with the forms of ownership, though their material, political and social standing is mediated and conditioned by the nature of dominant production relations. Consequently, they are not classes but certain social groups, some of which, say, doctors, teachers and other groups of the intelligentsia constitute, as it were, a "middle" social stratum between the main classes of society. True, depending on the type of society, they approximate to a greater or lesser extent to one class or another: in exploiter societies different strata of the people join the oppressed classes, swelling their ranks; the representatives of the intelligentsia more often than not come from the ruling classes and support them. Under socialism, when the working classes are the masters of their destiny, the intelligentsia, which comes from their midst, is a stratum serving the people.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, 1977, p. 421.

One can conclude from this that the division of society into classes has a bearing on entire social life and the entire system of social relations, both material and social relations proper. For instance, the position of nations in society, national relations, distinctions between the urban and the rural population and between brain and manual workers are all conditioned by the nature of class relations.

What are the conclusions to be made from this? Is it good for society to be divided into classes? Why are people so keen on eliminating distinctions between classes? All this will become clear if we consider relations between classes, particularly class relations under feudalism and capitalism.

## 2. Class Relations Under Feudalism and Capitalism

To begin with, it should be pointed out that not all the people oppose the division of society into classes, just as not everyone wants to see class distinctions eliminated in society. The point is that classes differ from each other not only quantitatively and qualitatively in accordance with the level of the development of production but they are also heterogeneous in their social, political and spiritual nature. This is caused by the fact that they perform different roles in social production, hold different views of the nature of the social system and make vastly differing contributions to social progress. At the same time not every class promotes social development; for instance, the feudal lords and the capitalists hinder its progress.

### What are the Classes of Feudal Lords and Capitalists After and What Role Do They Actually Play in Society?

The propertied classes exist only thanks to their ownership of private property. That is why they link their main economic interests above all with defending their property and getting on this basis constant and ever growing profits for themselves. They subordinate the tasks of social development to their thirst for personal enrichment. To attain this goal, they use their dominant position in the economy and place the working classes into extremely unfavourable conditions by mercilessly exploiting them and living parasitically off their labour. For this reason the propertied classes have their own morality, mentality and views of social life. They work out their own policy, are guided by their own ideology and enforce their own laws designed to perpetuate their privileges and their way of life. By spreading their policy, ideology, and legislation to the whole of society, the propertied classes subordinate the working classes economically, politically and spiriritually, dominate them, live at their expense and obstruct their development.

From time immemorial, ever since the first classes appeared (according to historiographers, in ancient Egypt, ancient Assyria and ancient Babylon in the 4th-3rd centuries B. C.; in ancient India and ancient China in the 3rd-2nd centuries B. C. and then in ancient Greece and Rome), relations between classes were those of exploitation and oppression. This exploitation was most blunt, heavy and undisguised in slave-owning society. The slave-owners, who possessed land, slaves, cattle and gold, appropriated everything or nearly everything produced by slaves. The latter, who possessed nothing and were themselves the property of the slave-owners, gave everything they produced to their masters, who owned slaves in exactly the same way as they owned things and instruments.

Under feudalism the situation of the oppressed classes was little better. Labourers were exploited here by being tied to land. Land owners, or feudal lords, gave peasants plots of land on condition that they also tilled the lands of their masters. Peasants were also personally dependent on land-owners because, possessing plots of land, they did corvée under coercion. The feudal economic system rests on non-economic coercion, serfdom, peasants' legal dependence on their land-owners and on their lack of equal rights.

The situation changes somewhat under capitalism. Capitalists and workers replace feudal lords and serfs respectively, because capitalism, far from abolishing exploitation of the oppressed people, only changes and makes the forms of exploitation more subtle. True, as compared with slaves, or serfs who do not possess full rights, workers are free on the face of it. This is seeming freedom, however. In fact, workers are just as dependent on capitalists as serfs on feudal lords and land-owners. Only the form of dependence is different in this case—economic. Workers, who are deprived of the means of production, can get jobs and means of sustenance only from capitalists and therefore sell themselves into economic bondage to them.

One may ask why peasants, workers and other oppressed classes accept this situation. Who gave the feudal lords and capitalists the right to treat the working people the way they do?

This is where private property comes in again. It not only divided people into classes but is also the key instrument of exploitation of some classes by others. It gives its owners the "right" to live at the expense of other members of society and to appropriate the surplus product, without bothering to work. Let it be recalled that in primitive-communal society with its extremely low labour productivity people were unable to produce the surplus product. And whatever they did produce was barely enough to sustain them. When labour efficiency grew as a result of the development of the productive forces and it was enough for people to work half the working hours to feed themselves, while the rest of the time was used to produce the surplus product, some people were given a chance to appropriate the surplus product of other people. Not anyone could do this, however, but only those who had accumulated and owned private property. This is due to the fact that private property creates objective prerequisites for inequality in the people's life activity from the outset. Every new-born person has, of course, an equal right to land, its resources, forests, waters and everything produced by the past generations. On seeing the light of the day, however, man finds out that all this wealth has already been divided between the owners and that there exist ready-made private property relations, which he is unable to change singlehanded. That is why not every person has favourable condidions at his disposal for making use of the boons of nature and social life. What happens then? Let us imagine a person, who is born to inherit more land than he himself can till or into a family that already owns factories and so on. What will that man do?

In the former case, depending on where his land is located, what its quality is and how many unemployed and landless families there are around, he will either let it or hire peasants to work this land.

In the latter case he will hire workers, giving them raw materials and trying to organize the production process.

In both cases, however, he won't be guided by pity or concern for peasants' or workers' employment. He will act in this way because for the land he lets or employment he provides at his factory he will take from them everything they produce in excess of what they need for their own existence. What is more, the practice of exploiter societies showed that the property owners, feudal lords and capitalists, seek to appropriate even part of the product necessary for the meagre existence of the workers and their families. For instance, in early feudal societies peasants paid their lords up to three fourths of the crops they took in, and in the landed estates using serf labour in Russia, up to a half of the entire harvest or the amount earned. In our day, too, wherever feudal relations persist the cost of land tenure remains extremely high. The richer a feudal lord becomes, the more opportunities he has to buy lands around and the poorer the majority of the peasants become; they are deprived even of the hope of getting land or a job from a feudal lord on acceptable terms. All this results in the feudal lords concentrating in their hands a bigger part of the national resources and leaving their people without adequate means of subsistence. Under the circumstances the feudal lords have unlimited opportunities to dictate their own terms of payment for the peasants' labour and to exploit their country's population. Small wonder that millions of peasants are constantly indebted to feudal lords and therefore fully depend on them. For instance, in Pakistan the peasants' debt to the feudal lords exceeds 5,000 million Pakistani rupees. The Saur Revolution of 1978 reduced the Afghan peasants' debt by more than 700 million Afghani.

Practically the same thing, albeit in a slightly different form, takes place in the capitalist economy. Capitalists, who own the means of production, hire workers to produce commodities and pay them a certain sum of money. On the face of it it looks as if a fair deal is concluded between capitalists and workers. Capitalists provide implements and workers give them their labour. In doing so capitalists assure that they pay workers for what they do in full. This is a far cry from reality, however. First, labour itself has no value. It acquires value only when it is embodied in some commodity, that is to say, we can speak of its value only in terms of the value of the goods produced. But without capitalists workers are unable to use their labour to produce commodities because they lack the means of labour, initial and raw materials for production. That is why they can sell capitalists not their labour but only their labour power, that is, a sum total of their physical and mental abilities that they use in producing material benefits. Consequently, capitalists pay workers not for the whole of their labour but merely for the value of their labour power, appropriating the surplus product. Second, workers do not get from capitalists all they need for existence, but only the amount sufficient to keep them going as workers. For this reason the mean span of life among the working people is lower than among the wealthy people—capitalists and landowners. In this way capitalists, who appropriate the surplus product created by workers without paying for it, constantly become richer, and this only because, as capitalists, they own the means of production. In the USA, for instance, the profit made by monopolies over the past 30-35 years grew approximately sevenfold, while the share of the working people's incomes dwindled considerably. Profits made by Japanese capitalists grow 2 or 3 times quicker than the wages their workers get. As compared with the 19th century, the level of exploitation in that country rose three times. Numerous methods of heightening exploitation are used at present. For example, along with the direct exploitation of hired workers in the process of capitalist production, there exists their indirect exploitation through the mechanism of trade and credits.

When consumer goods are sold on credit exploitation is effected by charging interest on the consumer's credit and selling goods at higher prices. The workers are also exploited by the bourgeois state that levies heavy taxes on them. Under present-day capitalism direct and indirect taxes swallow from one-fifth to one-third of wages, which results in the higher cost of living. The working people still live in very hard circumstances in Pakistan, Iran, Turkey, South Africa, Brazil, Haiti and some other Asian, African and Latin American countries. Land-owners and capitalists seek to place the responsibility for this state of affairs on to the working people themselves, claiming that they are lazy, have an extremely high birth-rate, and ignore the rules of religion and morality, and so on. In reality the working people's plight is caused by the fact that societies based on private property are exploiter societies, and by the reactionary nature of the class of feudal lords and capitalists.

The feudal lords and capitalists manifest their reactionary nature and anti-humanism by pursuing a policy, enforcing laws and cultivating morality that strip the working people of any economic, social and political guarantees and reduce them to the level of working automatons with no rights whatsoever. As a result of the aggressive essence of the exploiter classes fratricidal wars flare up among nations, carrying the toll of millions of human lives and destroying the material and cultural values produced by the working classes. That is why the propertied classes are also militarist classes.

## What Are the Working People After and What Role Do They Play in Society?

It is an altogether different matter as far as the working classes are concerned. These are for the most part made up of workers and peasants. In some cases alongside them and together with them, small-scale craftsmen, tradesmen, nomads and other indigent groups constitute the working section of society. The basic interests of these classes run counter to the interests of the exploiter classes.

The exploited are interested in seeing the material and cultural benefits they produce evenly distributed among all the members of society and in the interests of the whole society. The workers and the peasantry advocate brotherhood, equality and justice. In keeping with this they come out in favour of a policy, ideology and legislation that would serve the entire people. They are for friendship and cooperation between nations, for universal peace and social progress. Unlike the land-owners and capitalists, they feel no hatred of anyone, be it in their society or outside its bounds.

Peasants sing in their songs about land-owners that

> We are just as human as they
> And we can suffer just as much as they.

Their political slogans call for brotherhood, peace and cooperation. They are not guided by the desire to cash in at somebody's expense, including at the expense of other nations, and they oppose all types of exploitation. Thus the exploiters are lying when they allege that the Soviet Union, the state of the workers and the peasants, pursues hegemonistic goals and seeks economic advantages in one country or another through trying, for example, to seize other people's territories, etc. The workers and the peasantry of the Soviet Union, just like of other socialist countries, are perfectly aware that the progress of human society cannot be based on the abuse of man by man or on robbing the exploited class or through one nation plundering another. On the contrary, progress is ensured by promoting the development of social production and developing the diverse abilities of every person so that he could be involved in social production to the best of his abilities and with utmost effect. That is why the working people in the socialist countries and the Soviet Union come out against any exploitation and aggression. Therefore the true role of the working people in social life is above all to produce the material and cultural wealth of society and to represent everything of the best and most humane in social relations. The working people are the genuine motive force of social progress and the chief makers of human history.

Their practical activities in producing material and cultural values, their humanist morality and active support for progressive policy, ideology and just state and international law accord with the requirements of the laws of social development, the requirements of science and progress. That is why the working classes are progressive classes. And therefore the future of mankind is closely connected above all with the destinies of the working classes.

We asked at the beginning of this chapter what side any honest, just and humane citizen of one country or another should take, if he wants justice, humaneness and honesty for all and everyone. The obvious answer is: the side of the working classes. To serve the cause of the working classes and to fight for their ideals means to serve the cause of human progress and human civilization. We have also explained that the division of society into classes at certain stages of its development is an objective process.

At the same time we would take issue with those who seek to preserve this class division deliberately and who, despite the requirements of the objective laws of social development, consciously obstruct the levelling out of social heterogeneity and stand in the way of just social relations.

This is to say that the heart of the matter is not so much that society became divided into classes by force of the objective laws of its development but that it is divided into qualitatively heterogeneous classes which play different roles in social development. Some of them, despite the requirements of the laws of social development, try to hinder it for the sake of their own enrichment, that is to stop the natural historical process. At all times these have been the propertied classes, which came into being with the emergence of private property.

Other classes would like to create conditions that would be most harmonized with the requirements of the laws of social development and favour the building of a society without any exploitation of man by man. At all times these have been the working classes.

Consequently, the task is not so much to ignore the objective process of social development and eliminate all classes prematurely at will but to eradicate the causes dividing people into progressive and reactionary classes, that is, to abolish the private ownership of the main means of production.

This is precisely what sets the exploiters and the exploited at variance with each other and where their vital interests clash, giving birth to irreconcilable contradictions between them. The exploiters want to maintain the status quo which they find to their liking, while the exploited seek to change it because they find it unbearable.

Naturally, irreconcilable contradictions have always existed and will continue to exist between the exploiters and the exploited until the former disappear from the face of the Earth.

## 3. Class Struggle as a Consequence of the Operation of Exploiter Societies. Ways of Eliminating Class Distinctions and Classes

We have seen that there exist irreconcilable contradictions between the main classes in exploiter societies which are generated in the final analysis by material, economic relations and relate directly to the people's vital needs. Awareness of these contradictions and needs turns into concrete and realized goals, acting as a motive force in people's activity. Driven to despair, the more oppressed classes rise to a resolute struggle against their oppressors.

Countless class battles, armed uprisings, and sharp clashes so common in human history attest to the irreconcilability of the vital interests of the opposite classes and to the fact that there is a limit to the exploited people's tolerance of injustice and economic and social abuse they suffer from the exploiters. This is illustrated by the courageous and selfless feats performed by slaves in Greece and Rome, the heroic anti-feudal struggle waged by peasants under the leadership of Mazdak in Iran, Afghanistan and Central Asia, peasant rebellions led by Wat Tyler in England, Jan Hus in Czechoslovakia, Thomas Münzer in Germany, Stepan Razin and Yemelyan Pugachev in Russia, etc.

Both slave uprisings and serf peasant rebellions met with failure. The two classes did not occupy a position in social production at that time that would enable them to form the necessary organization, to set themselves real goals and to mobilize the necessary means to accomplish them. The actions of the Lyons workers in France in 1830, the uprising of the Silesian weavers in Germany in the 1840s, the active participation of workers in the 1848 revolutions and in the first socialist revolution of 1871 (the Paris Commune) in France and other revolutions of the 19th century, were more mature and dealt more telling blows at the exploiters. But they, too, suffered defeat. The workers were not organized enough, had no parties as their political vanguard, and failed to coordinate their actions with the peasantry, another oppressed class. Furthermore, they lacked clearly-defined goals in revolution, had no scientific theory that would prompt them how to act not only in the course of the revolution but after seizing power so that they could hold that power in their hands. All this was achieved in the course of the subsequent development of the productive forces, the growth of class consciousness among the working people and scientific analysis of the experience of the past revolutions. This was how Marxist theory was worked out. Marx and Engels also initiated and founded the first international communist party, the Communist League, which, as the true spokesman of the interests of the working class and of the oppressed, began preparing the exploited people's struggle against the oppressors. In October 1917 the Russian workers and peasants guided by the Russian Communist Party of Bolsheviks, which was led by Lenin, dealt the first crushing blow at the landowners and capitalists.

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution marked a new stage in human history, the period of transition from capitalism to socialism and communism.

The working classes in the capitalist world no longer want to put up with exploitation and they have entered struggle against the existing exploiter regimes. This found expression in the fact that in the few past decades alone the world saw more than 80 socialist, national liberation and democratic revolutions. Among them were revolutions in Afghanistan, Mozambique, Angola, Ethiopia, the Yemen and some other countries. Class struggle goes on today and practically all the imperialist countries without exception have become the scene of acute class battles. The number of those involved in them is growing every year. For instance, the number of wage workers in the capitalist countries increased by 50 per cent as compared with 1940, whereas the number of strikers trebled. In the past five years the number of strikers in the developed capitalist countries totalled about 300 million. Especially powerful strikes have taken place in the leading capitalist countries, such as the strikes involving 20 million in France and 12 million in Italy, while the major strikes held in the USA, Britain, Japan and Australia in 1979-80 were on an unprecedented scale for the 20th century. Strike action mounted in West Germany, Belgium, Argentina, Uruguay and so on. In the course of this struggle political demands are also being made along with economic demands.

Acute class battles continue wherever the exploiters were overthrown but are trying to restore their economic and social privileges. Angola, Ethiopia, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Kampuchea and many other countries saw class struggle between the working people defending their rule and the former exploiters supported by international reaction. Such struggle is inevitable because the defeated classes exist for quite a while and put up fierce resistance to the new authorities. They cannot reconcile themselves to the fact that the working people have put an end to their political and economic sway and encroached upon private property. Apart from resorting to barbarous means of destroying the revolutionary working people, they seek help from their fellow exploiters in other countries.

Let us turn back now to the question formulated at the beginning of the chapter, namely, what classes engage in struggle and why? The short answer is—because there are the oppressor and the oppressed classes in society based on private property. The oppressors would like to live at the expense of the oppressed forever, while the oppressed classes are unwilling to put up with this situation. Wherever their life is especially hard, they rise up for resolute struggle. This will be so as long as the exploiters exist.

## The Ways to Eliminate Class Distinctions and Classes

Scientific analysis of historical development shows that the problem of classes and class struggle is generated by the objective conditions of the existence of exploiter societies rather than by the wishes of individuals. These societies of necessity produce acute class contradictions between the exploiters and the exploited, which eventually result in class struggle between them. At certain stages of social development therefore class struggle is law-governed and inevitable. Needless to say, the working classes do not wish this struggle to take place but they see no other way towards their emancipation. Class struggle alone enables them to gain democratic freedoms and to extend their civil and social rights. Class struggle alone leads to democratic and socialist revolutions, to the overthrow of the exploiters and the establishment of the government of the working people. Only through class struggle can a society be built, that has eliminated the causes of social and economic inequality and the exploitation of man by man. Hence class struggle is not merely law-governed but also *constitutes the motive force of social development in the antagonistic socio-economic formations.*

The question arises: what awaits classes in a society which has abolished exploitation and private ownership of the means of production? After all even under socialism society is still divided into classes. Won't this lead to struggle between them under some circumstances, particularly since, as we have already mentioned, class struggle is a law-governed phenomenon?

Classes, of course, still continue to exist under socialism. However, these are not the antagonistic classes of the exploiters and the exploited but the friendly classes of the workers and the peasants. Their friendship, cooperation and fraternal mutual assistance are determined by the fact that both the workers and the peasants are the toiling classes. They have no interest in deriving profit at the expense of each other. On the contrary, they are equally interested in ensuring a better life for each and everyone and in social development and progress. Their unity, cohesion and brotherhood are based on common vital economic interests and common key goals. There is no struggle between these classes, nor can there ever be.

Of course, under socialism, especially at the initial stages, there are certain distinctions in the economic and social positions of classes. This is conditioned by the objective process of the development of social production, the unequal position occupied by these classes in the system of social production, the existence of two forms of property, state and collective-farm and of cooperative property, and their share in producing social wealth. These distinctions between classes are not everlasting under socialism. From the outset the friendly classes work to eliminate them and to then put an end to the division of society into classes altogether.

The working class has the leading role to play in this process, displaying greater organization, discipline and better training and therefore possessing greater labour productivity. It is also the more revolutionary class, which actively initiates the revolutionary transformation of society. Acting as the leader of all the working classes, however, it does not seek to use its advantages only for itself. A close alliance with the peasantry and all the other working people has always been the main principle of the working class. After overthrowing the rule of the exploiters and taking power into its own hands, the working class uses this power to eliminate the essential distinctions in the situation of different classes. These distinctions diminish as socialism is built. Gaps are bridged between town and country and between brain and manual work. The 26th CPSU Congress pointed out that these distinctions can be practically eliminated under developed socialism.

As social production develops and social wealth is accumulated, the reasons dividing society into classes will finally disappear.

As you see, it was economic reasons that gave birth to classes and the same reasons that will eliminate them. There was a time when society was not divided into classes, and there will be a time when this division again disappears. Classes and class relations therefore are historically transient phenomena; future society will know no classes. Class distinctions, however, will not be eliminated spontaneously. This process is only possible by building socialism and communism, with the working class parties organizing and guiding it. In classless society all its members will have equal opportunities and equal relations to the means of production. This means that all its citizens will work according to their abilities and receive according to their needs. Needless to say, the elimination of classes is a long process, which takes an entire historical epoch ushered in by the socialist revolution: It passes through several stages and is completed only under communism. The socialist revolution copes with the task of overthrowing the rule of the exploiting classes, which is indispensable in the genuine elimination of classes. The experience of building socialism in the USSR and other socialist countries shows that transition from capitalism to socialism is very complicated. First, private capitalist property is abolished at this stage.. Second, an organizational restructuring of the entire social system is effected through transition from the individual, isolated small-commodity economy of peasants and craftsmen to the large-scale social economy. The main class distinctions between the workers and the peasantry are eliminated on the basis of socialist cooperation.

As socialism is being built and developed, class distinctions continue to be erased and the class structure of society changes. This process can be illustrated by changes in the class structure of socialist society in the USSR. In 1939 industrial and office workers accounted for 52.5 per cent of the Soviet population, the collective farmers for 44.9 per cent, and individual farmers and handicraftsmen for 2.6 per cent. Twenty years later, in 1959, industrial and office workers accounted for 68.3 per cent of the Soviet population, while the number of collective farmers had fallen to 31.4 per cent. Individual farmers and handicraftsmen almost disappeared and accounted for a mere 0.3 per cent. In 1980 industrial and office workers accounted for about 80 per cent, while collective farmers constituted a little over 20 per cent. In this way society becomes more homogeneous and other distinctions between the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia also disappear. As the material and technical basis of communism is built the persisting differences between them will be eliminated and they will turn into the workers of a classless communist society, which guarantees equal social standing to all the people.

The elimination of inter-class and inter-group distinctions is closely connected with the elimination of intra-class and intra-group differences, that is, differences between types of work, training, education, etc. As far as the working class is concerned, this presupposes, for instance, the elimination of unskilled and semi-skilled labour and the approximation of the medium-skilled to skilled workers, the approximation of the work performed by rural workers (on state farms) to that performed by urban workers (in industry) and so on. Farmers or rather agricultural workers will perform skilled work, which will in no way differ from any other type of work socially and economically. Distinctions between people as far as their skills are concerned will lose any socio-economic meaning.

### *Test Questions*

1. Why were there no classes in primitive-communal society?
2. How did classes come into being and what are classes?
3. What is class struggle and why does it take place?
4. Will classes exist forever?
5. Why is the class approach necessary in analyzing one social phenomenon or another?

*Chapter X*

# POLITICAL ORGANIZATION OF SOCIETY

Relations between classes are not restricted to economic relations but also include political relations. After all the economic and material life of classes finds its concentrated expression in political interests and struggle for power. The exploiting classes would not be able to keep in subordination the exploited classes or exploit them for long without being supported by a political organization of society or without having political power. On the other hand, the exploited classes, unwilling to put up with their plight, begin opposing the exploiter classes not only to eliminate economic inequality but also to attain political power. The history of class struggle has taught the exploited classes that they would not be able to improve their material situation without winning political power. Economic struggle only temporarily alleviates their situation. When they find themselves in difficulties, the exploiters make concessions to the working people only to strengthen their own rule in a subtler and more reliable way.

It is therefore natural that questions of the political organization of society and political relations in society arose acute ideological disputes. Especially fierce ideological war is waged on the problem of the state, the core of the political organization of society. Lenin pointed out that "you are not likely to find another question which has been so confused, deliberately and unwittingly, by representatives of bourgeois science, philosophy, jurisprudence, political economy and journalism, as the question of the state".[1]

Bourgeois ideologists have always sought to picture the state as a body responsible for maintaining public order and safeguarding the interests of all classes and social groups alike. They seek to represent the exploiter state as a body "making no distinction between the rich and the poor, between employers and wage workers", as a body providing for "social harmony" and "universal well-being". Advocates of this concept try to bolster up their theory with numerous examples. They usually argue that in any exploiter state neither a feudal lord nor a capitalist can use arms against workers without impunity even if they go on strike. If the state were to safeguard the interests of one class alone—the class of land-owners and capitalists—it would not have punished employers, it is asserted, for killing workers or peasants; it would have paid no attention. But as it does punish everybody for murder, it therefore protects the interests of all the classes.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "The State", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 472.

But is this in fact the case?

To be able to answer this question and to consider other questions relating to political relations, it is necessary to see, if only briefly, how the state came into being and what its role is in the life of society.

## 1. What Is the State? Historical Types of the State

### The Essence of the State and the Reasons for Its Emergence

The state is an instrument of political power of the class dominant in the economy. "The state," to quote Lenin, "is a machine for maintaining the rule of one class over another."[1]

It is clear from these definitions that the state as a body, instrument, machine and political organization is closely connected above all with classes and exists together with classes. This means that the state has not always existed. Indeed, people knew no state at the primitive-communal stage. Peoples whose development was retarded by concrete historical circumstances and who knew no division into classes had no state either. In these societies public affairs were run by the community of people and power was not separated from the people. Nor was there any special apparatus to systematically use coercion and to subordinate people to it. Social relations were regulated on the basis of deep-rooted customs, the prestige, respect and authority of the elders and chiefs. The latter's prestige depended on their personal characteristics. The absence of officials, the army and prisons, which were produced to govern others, in no way affected the normal course of affairs. People could do without the state and on no occasion did any conflict shatter the public order, nor did society fall into a state of anarchy. Though there was no state, there existed a common bond among the people and society itself functioned normally.

Why then was such a situation possible? Why could people live without social coercion making it unnecessary? Could they have been more conscious at the time?

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "The State", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 478.

The point is that as classes were absent in primitive society, far-reaching social contradictions could hardly have appeared there either. For this reason primitive society saw no clashes between social forces and needed no body of coercion. History shows that the state appears only wherever and whenever society is divided into classes. This in its turn is determined by the fact that private ownership only comes into being at a certain stage of social development. The private ownership of the means of production, be it lands, forests, rivers, production facilities, slaves, material and cultural values, especially if they are accumulated through coercion, have to be preserved and protected. Furthermore, to increase private property, one has to resort to more coercion, by forcing the dependent workers to labour. Besides, real power is needed to make people work in such society and keep them subordinated. It is therefore only natural that under the circumstances the economically dominant class felt the need to produce a special organization, the state. Consequently the state came into being as the main political institute of society ensuring rule of the propertied classes over the exploited. The bodies of coercion, including the army, prisons, the courts, the police, the gendarmery and the bureaucratic apparatus, became the tools of power. Law, which reflected the will of the ruling class in the form of state laws, emerged together with the state. Traditional statutes and rules of clan society gave way to integral state law, which regulated property and civil relations so that proprietors alone stood to gain from it. This is borne out by the establishment of a special system of taxation and duties to maintain the state apparatus, the army, the police, and so on. The working people had to bear the brunt of taxation. It is therefore understandable why the working classes experienced no need for the state. However, though it was formed against the will of the people to subordinate and suppress them, it was maintained at their expense.

The state was used not only to exact taxes for the upkeep of its apparatus and all its other structural elements, but, what is the main thing, the entire economic activity of the working people depended on the proprietors. Having power in their hands and an enormous apparatus of coercion, the ruling classes could manipulate at will the classes and social groups subordinated by them, forcing the dispossessed classes to work for the exploiters and oppressing them economically and politically. The degree of this oppression and exploitation depended on concrete historical conditions and the level of development of production and productive forces. Whatever the circumstances, the common people, as a rule, had little concern for the state, as they hardly needed it.

## The Historical Types of the State

As a political tool of the economically dominant class, the state develops the corresponding structural forms and methods of governing. The slave-owning, feudal and capitalist states corresponded to slave-owning, feudal and capitalist societies. The socialist state exists at the first stage of the communist formation. All types of the state have basic characteristics, including the territorial principle of the power structure, the presence of public bodies of power and the government apparatus, the army, taxation, and some special means of coercion divorced from the people.

Every type of the state has different forms, to ensure that it best functions in the interests of the ruling class. For instance, a republic and a monarchy of the aristocracy were a typical form of the slave-owning and feudal states. Republic is a form of the state system in which the main bodies of power are formed through elections. A closed circle of rich people of noble origin, that is to say, descending from clan and tribal chiefs, had the right to form state bodies and to hold administrative posts in a republic ruled by the aristocracy with the result that democracy here was an empty word inasmuch as it was only enjoyed by a small group of people, the slave-owners. Most of the working people were deprived of any rights, to say nothing of the slaves, who were not treated as people and were outlaws. Under feudalism the state was most often in the form of monarchy. Monarchy is a state governed by a monarch (tsar, king or shah), who, as a rule, inherits power and exercizes it singlehandedly (absolute monarchy). In their struggle for power the ruling classes sometimes, especially in capitalist society, obtain part of that power setting up parliament alongside the monarch, and divide power between the monarch and the parliament, restricting the power of the monarch (the so-called limited or constitutional monarchy). At present, for instance, constitutional monarchies exist in Great Britain, Norway, Denmark and Sweden. As a rule, the working classes have no part to play in running such a state and their social rights are extremely limited.

The bourgeois type of state in the form of a republic, constitutional monarchy, and so on, corresponds to the capitalist system. All these forms are determined by opportunities and the alignment of social forces, traditions and expediency, but their prime aim is to maintain and strengthen the political power of the ruling class. That is why Lenin called the capitalist type of the state a committee for running the affairs of the bourgeoisie and a machine to oppress the working prople. This type of the state has two basic functions, namely, to ensure the exploitation of the working people and to organize the economic, political, commercial, diplomatic and military activity in the interests of the bourgeoisie.

At present the might of the capitalist state is combined with the power of the monopolies, and this enhances its exploiter function, makes it increasingly serve the interests of the monopolies and curtails the rights of the working people, with the result that the state becomes imperialist. The conventional methods of coercion of the working class by the state are now supplemented by the "legalized" forms, such as the forced settlement of a conflict between workers and employers in favour of the proprietors, systematic redistribution of the national income in the interests of monopolies through financial and taxation policy, and so on. All the modern imperialist states have an active apparatus to exercise ideological and political pressure on the working people.

Mounting reaction in all fields is a characteristic feature of imperialism in general. It is especially graphically manifest in the USA, where the recent few years have seen the growing activity of extreme right-wing forces and their greater influence on the country's foreign and home policies. At present reactionary elements account for the greater part of the state apparatus, as a result of which the state aims to militarize the country, eliminating democratic freedoms and thwarting the policy of easing tensions. Anti-communism expounded by the ruling elite creates an atmosphere of terror, police repressions, and massacres of the people fighting to see their economic and political demands satisfied.

Throughout its existence bourgeois democracy is restricted to the ruling class and is characterized by hypocrisy. It gives no material guarantees for the exercise of democratic rights and freedoms and its citizens are unequal in economic, national, racial and social respects.

Taken together, these and other restrictions exclude the mass of the people from active participation in democracy. This gives force to Lenin's pronouncement that "the most important questions—war, peace, diplomatic questions—are decided by a small handful of capitalists, who deceive not only the masses, but very often parliament itself".[1] The monopoly capital in power steps up its onslaught on the working people and seeks to completely monopolize political power, to have unrestricted sway over the working people and to strip the people of the right to struggle for their own interests.

## Statehood in the Developing Countries

During periods of transition there arise transitory forms of state formations along with the main types of states, in which one ruling class is in power. The present-day period of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism is especially distinctive in this respect. Entire continents are involved in the revolutionary liberation movement, which is characterized by a great diversity of motive forces, rates, forms of socio-political associations of the people, the make-up of political parties and the degree to which outside forces affect the liberation struggle.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "Ninth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.), March 29-April 5, 1920", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, 1977, p. 488

As a result there are nowadays numerous national, people's revolutionary-democratic states of complex class structure and states of socialist orientation in the newly-free developing countries. As distinct from the states in exploiter societies, these states are to a lesser extent or even in no way at all an instrument at the hands of the ruling class. For instance, in Eastern countries the role of the state is increased largely by factors connected with history and social psychology rather than by the interests and requirements of the class of proprietors.

The absence of an economically and politically dominant, leading class, and the multiplicity of economic forms, which prevented complete class differentiation, show that the reasons for the emergence of the state are somewhat different there. Consequently, it has qualitatively different, more democratic functions there. It is not a means of exploitation (especially if progressive leaders are in power) but undertakes planning, regulation and the granting of licenses. In these countries the state shoulders the major burden of restructuring the colonial economic system. The newly-free countries have no big proprietors and therefore no group of people who could find the means to develop modern industry. It is only the state which can tackle this colossal task of building a modern economy. Only the state can mobilize the necessary means, accumulate capital, afford financing projects that give no profit during the early years and establish the international economic contacts necessary to procure raw materials and equipment.

Moreover, the state there plays an important role in developing national self-consciousness. In many of these countries societies are made up of a host of ethnical groups and tribes speaking different languages, which creates difficulties in their unification. The state, in particular the policy of state nationalism with its slogans like, for example, "We are all Afghans rather than Pushtuns, Hazaras, or Tajiks" or "We are all Indians rather than Bengali, Tamils or Maratha", is a means enabling people of different nationalities and religious beliefs to become conscious of being part of an integral community and in some cases provides the preconditions for the formation of a nation. Only the state can pursue such a policy and oppose all sorts of centrifugal and separatist trends.

The absence of strong, economically independent classes ensures that the state employs the services of representatives of the most diverse social strata, including those from among the ordinary people. This helps the state, on the one hand, to express better the interests of the entire people, and, on the other, to foster among the members of society respect for state authority and its legal acts.

At the same time, for all the advantages the state has in the developing countries, their extreme diversity makes it imperative to discern, when assessing the role of the state, what class or classes and what political parties are in power and in whose interests they carry out political rule. This is the procedure to be followed until the country builds a new society without any exploitation. Along with the development of this society, the new state will also develop and improve. Society without exploitation has the corresponding new form of the state, the dictatorship of the proletariat in one of its forms, and the state of the whole people at a higher level of social development. The state of the proletarian dictatorship and its higher stage, the state of the whole people, constitute a qualitatively new type of the state, which leads to the withering away of the state entirely.

Let us analyze this type of the state in greater detail.

## 2. The State After the Overthrow of the Exploiters' Rule

When in the course of acute class struggle the revolutionary working people defeat the exploiters and establish new social relations on the basis of the public ownership of the means of production, the question arises what to do with the old exploiter state. Should it be put to the service of new society or eliminated altogether or else replaced by a new one?

Marx and Engels and later Lenin gave much thought to these questions. His study of the 1848 revolutions in France, Germany and Austro-Hungary led Marx to the conclusion in 1852 that the victorious proletariat could hardly use the old, bourgeois state machinery. The old state, geared to the exploitation and suppression of the masses, is an important body of counter-revolution in its struggle against the revolutionary forces.

Consequently, it must be smashed and destroyed. Nevertheless, the working people cannot do without the state after their victory. It takes a long time to transform old society into a new, classless society. Classes are not eliminated at this "political transition stage" and work is not yet a vital need but is done of necessity. This is to say that not all people work conscientiously, to the utmost of their potential. It is therefore necessary to distribute the social product in keeping with special rules, for instance, in keeping with the amount and quality of work done. Public control over the measure of work and the measure of consumption is also called for. It is necessary to organize labour, to educate the working people, to combat those who stand in the way of building a new society and to protect it from encroachments by the existing exploiter states.

All this calls for a special public body to perform all these tasks at this stage in the building of a new society. But what should this body be like? In Marx's opinion, it should also be a state but the state of a new type, in which power should belong to the working class rather than to the exploiters, the bourgeoisie. In other words, the state of the dictatorship of the exploiter classes, particularly the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, has to be replaced by the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

When substantiating the historical need for the dictatorship of the proletariat, Marx argued that without it the workers would be unable to either hold power, suppress bourgeois counter-revolution, remake the economy of society, change the people's mentality or eventually build a communist society.

Marx formulated the idea in the "Critique of the Gotha Programme" (1875) in the following way: between capitalism and socialism as the first stage of communism lies a transition period that cannot be bypassed. During this period it is necessary to develop and complete the socialist revolution, to build an entirely new economic system, to change the social structure, to rid society of the exploiter classes, to train the new intelligentsia, to revolutionize people's minds and to ensure the victory of communist ideology. There corresponds to this period a political transition period in which the state can be nothing else but the *revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.*

Drawing on the theoretical conclusions of Marx and Engels and on his own analysis of the new conditions of class struggle, Lenin also came to the conclusion that the dictatorship of the proletariat was indispensable. It was necessary to suppress the resistance of the overthrown exploiter classes, strengthen the alliance between the working class and the mass of the working people and the non-proletarian strata of the population, guide them and organize the people in building a socialist society.

The essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat lies in the political guidance by the worling class of the broad mass of the working people in building a new social system. The highest principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the alliance of the working class with the peasantry under the guidance of the working class.

The experience of all 20th-century revolutions has fully confirmed the veracity of the doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin of the historical inevitability of the transition period and of the epoch of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Transition from capitalism to communism is impossible without a transition period, i. e. the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

No matter where a democratic or a socialist revolution takes place, the working people always have to make strenuous efforts to hold and consolidate their power. The overthrown exploiters do not wish to reconcile themselves to the loss of their dominion or relinquish power without resistance. They do everything to use their political experience against the working people who lack it, against the socialist power of the workers and peasants. That is why the revolutionary transformation is accompanied by sabotage, subversive activities and political coups carried out by the exploiter classes. The dictatorship of the proletariat has to suppress the defeated classes until they stop resistance.

At the same time the state of the proletarian dictatorship undertakes much work to neutralize the petty bourgeoisie (small-scale landlords) and establish alliance with middle peasants (well-off peasants). It attracts them to the side of the people's government and then starts forging the moral and political unity of society, in which the dictatorship of the proletariat discards its function of suppressing the exploiter classes within the country.

An important task facing the working class after its accession to power is the harnessing and elimination of spontaneous economic development. It is necessary not only to nationalize the main means of production but also to organize the socialist economy in accordance with the main goal—the building of socialist and communist societies.

There is also the task of carrying through a cultural revolution and training a national intelligentsia from among the people. The victorious working classes will also have to surmount serious difficulties in ensuring the security of the new society. History shows that the international bourgeoisie and reactionary forces have never refrained from attempts to stifle the emergent state, resorting not only to economic sanctions but also to military force. It is therefore only the state of the proletarian dictatorship that can tackle this task and cope with all difficulties associated with it.

As society develops, so also does the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Under developed, mature socialism it grows into the state of the whole people representing the interests of all classes: the workers, the peasantry and the people's intelligentsia.

Thus the socialist state comes into being as the rule of the working class allied with all the working people, particularly the peasantry, and subsequently grows into the state of the whole people. It goes without saying that the state of the proletarian dictatorship is also a form of political domination, but it is the rule of the absolute majority of the population, of the working people over the minority, the former exploiters, rather than that of the exploiter minority over the oppressed majority.

In this connection it is pertinent to mention three points that often evoke questions and sometimes give rise to misunderstanding. *First*, the elimination of the exploiter classes does not at all mean the physical extermination of the former oppressors. It is a matter of merely eliminating the conditions which enabled the exploiter minority to oppress the majority of the working people, that is, of abolishing the large-scale private property of the land, plants and factories. The socialist state has to use the means of suppression against those representatives of the former exploiters who mount an armed resistance to the new system. Furthermore, the nature and forms of coercion in these cases depend on the degree and forms of resistance by the overthrown classes. If the former exploiters do not resist the social transformation being carried out, they are given an equal right to participation in this transformation like the rest of the citizens. Those who do not wish to remain in the new society are given the chance to leave the country. In such a case many of them are partially compensated for the cost of their former property nationalized by the new system, as was the case in the USSR. It should also be pointed out that not all private property but only large-scale private property, where there is an obvious gap between the owners and the production process, is nationalized, i. e. transferred to society. This does not concern small business belonging to small-scale industrialists, small dealers, peddlers and peasant farms, in which the owners are largely involved in production and management. This is explained firstly by the fact that a huge number of the owners of these production units and members of their families have an important role to play in social production and are useful to society. Society itself is at first unable to exercise centralized management of these farms, production and trade units. Naturally, it finds it useful to have such voluntary production organizers. For this reason in many instances, far from taking away small property, it, on the contrary, allots it to those who were dispossessed in the exploiter society. Secondly, though small proprietors do have capitalist and individualistic views, they nevertheless help to consolidate the new state, because the revolutionary transformation proves beneficial to them (for instance, it not only saves them competition with big business that ruins them but renders them all kinds of support). In its turn the new state applies towards them measures that would increasingly win them over to the side of the new social system. Engels wrote: "Our task relative to the small peasant consists, in the first place, in effecting a transition of his private enterprise and private possession to co-operative ones, not forcibly but by dint of example and the proffer of social assistance for this purpose."[1]

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries used state farms and machine-and-tractor stations to show the advantages producers get from the large-scale social economy and modern production methods.

---

[1] Frederick Engels, "The Peasant Question in France and Germany", in: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, 1976, p. 470.

One farmstead replaces several hundreds of smaller farms; small commodity producers learn to produce together and their individualistic views gradually give way to collectivist ideas; the process is facilitated by the system of education and good communal services that can be developed in a large-scale collective economy. All this expands their world outlook and promotes their political maturity. Co-operative methods are sometimes also used to unite craftsmen and small-scale producers in industry, as a result of which they are gradually involved in the state sector.

*Second*, the rule of the working class, the proleterian dictatorship, in no way rejects democracy. On the contrary, it presupposes the establishment and development of a new type of democracy—democracy for the majority. Unlike the latter, the formal bourgeois democracy is essentially democracy for the exploiters, that is to say, for the minority, and at the same time it presupposes coercion and suppression of the working people, i. e. for the majority, who are in fact unable to exercise the rights they are supposed to possess.

*Third*, it is necessary to differentiate between the class content of the proletarian dictatorship and its forms. The Paris Commune of 1871 was the first historical form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the USSR the proletarian dictatorship was established in the form of the Soviets of Workers', Peasants' and Soldiers' Deputies. In other socialist countries it took the form of people's democracy. Other forms are, no doubt, also possible. But no matter what form the proletarian dictatorship adopts, its essence is the same—the working class undertakes the guidance of society.

In considering the political guidance of society by the working class, it should be remembered that life constantly calls for the creative development of this idea and of the entire Marxist doctrine. Lenin believed that the liberation revolutions in Asian, African and Latin American countries with their vast peculiarities and distinctive national traditions would inevitably give birth to new forms of political rule of the working class. He pointed out that in backward Oriental countries it would be the matter of people's peasant rule rather than exclusively proletarian rule. Using the example of the Russian revolution, Lenin showed the prime importance of the alliance between the workers and the peasants. According to him, this alliance was absolutely indispensable for the revolutionary development of the Oriental countries.

The appearance of a large group of countries of socialist orientation in Asia and Africa provides indisputable proof of Lenin's idea about the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the people, which encompasses all the strata of the working people, including the emergent working class, and relies on the peasantry, the biggest class of the working people in these countries.

For this reason the socialist state (no matter what forms it adopts) is the only state capable of offering the working classes real opportunities to build a society without exploitation, a socialist society.

Another distinctive feature of the socialist state is that it is the only state which by nature is capable of withering away after all the tasks it was formed to cope with are accomplished, namely, the tasks of building a classless communist society. When classes disappear and the tasks of building a communist society are resolved, society will be managed through a combination of state and public rule. Numerous public organizations of the working people, including trade unions, women's and youth organizations, different creative unions of scholars and so on, will take a more and more active part in the affairs of the state. Work collectives are to take a special place in this management.

This merger of government and public principles will guarantee a gradual transition to communist self-government. In other words, when communism becomes established all over the world the state will be unnecessary and will die away. The bodies of communist public self-government will run public affairs. After all communism is a highly-organized society of conscious and harmoniously developed people. All members of society are to take part in this government, which will no longer need the authority of force. The latter will be replaced by the force of public opinion enhanced by the people's consciousness and organization.

These are things of the future, so to speak. But what does the socialist state give society under socialism, the first stage of the communist formation? What is socialism and how do people live under it?

Briefly, the socialist socio-political system, the socialist state, frees people from social and national oppression. It meets to the fullest extent the needs for increasing social production efficiency, raising the working people's living standards, eliminating poverty, starvation and other social evils, and steadily promoting peace and social progress. Precisely for this reason bourgeois ideologists bend over backwards to denigrate socialism and distort its essence. On the one hand, posing as advocates of socialism, they urge inexperienced politicians to look for their own "models" of socialism and try to divide socialism according to national principle, split the socialist countries, prevent them from using each other's experience, and hinder their development.

On the other hand, they nurture hopes of gradually eroding the scientific theory of socialism, equating the concept of socialism with concepts defaming it. For instance, the bourgeois ideologist, Louis Fischer asserts that words like "socialism", "communism", and "colonialism" are empty vessels into which one can pour either poison or wine; they are neither scientific expressions nor unchanging terms. They change in time and space.

## Socialist Society and Its Main Characteristics

What are the advantages offered by socialist society, as compared with other societies? Why do people strive towards socialism? Socialist society is above all society, in which the whole of power belongs to the working people and which introduces the public ownership of the means of production—industry, land, roads, etc. This society organizes the conscious and planned development of production and of the productive forces.

Society and individuals greatly benefit from this trasformation. To begin with, exploitation of man by man is eliminated and the products of society's entire collective labour can no longer become the property of an individual or of several people. Under socialism the goals of production change radically from the enrichment of a handful of capitalists and landowners to ensuring the well-being and harmonious development of all society members and meeting to a greater extent their constantly growing material and cultural needs. All this is facilitated by the planned development of production and the productive forces.

In society based on private property new factories and plants are built and the production of a certain commodity is expanded when this can give high profits, though these profits in no way benefit the working people.

Under socialism the national economic plan endorsed by the government envisages both the development of the means of production and the production of consumer goods (foodstuffs, clothes, footwear and so on) entirely in keeping with the requirements of the people. Consumer goods are, incidentally, distributed in accordance with the amount and quality of work done, that is, according to one's work. Egalitarianism is not possible here because socialist society rests on a basis inherited from capitalism and feudalism rather than on an entirely new foundation. People emerging from exploiter society are not equal in their production abilities and diligence. One can give society more and another less. Consequently, if society wants to be just to its members, it should treat everyone of them individually. Otherwise, "people would have put in different amounts of work and got equal payment".[1] That is why socialism proclaims: "He who does not work, neither shall he eat." It is only just to give higher living standards to those who put in more socially-useful work. For this reason everyone tries to produce more and of better quality. This situation persists till the advent of communism. Distribution will then be based on the principle, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need", which serves to interest people in augmenting public wealth and raising labour productivity, and opens up prospects for production development. In its turn, this leads to a sharp increase in social production growth rates and in production output.

---

[1] Karl Marx, "Critique on the Gotha Programme", in: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 19.

For instance, in the 60 years of its existence, the Soviet Union developed large-scale industry with up-to-date technology and diversified agriculture. Industrial output grew more than 225 times, despite the fact that it took the Soviet state about 20 years during the six decades to defend itself from outside enemies and to restore the economy that had been razed by war. Indeed, in the four years of the war unleashed against the Soviet Union by fascist Germany the USSR lost about 30 per cent of its national wealth.

In other socialist countries industrial output also grew at high rates. In 30 years it saw a 12-fold increase, while in the leading capitalist countries of Europe within the Common Market it grew by a mere 260 per cent in the same period. Industrial output of the socialist countries forming the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) is now 110 per cent higher than that of the Common Market members and 50 per cent higher than that of the USA. In general the socialist countries within CMEA account for one-third of world output, though they are inhabited by a little over 10 per cent of the entire population of the Earth.

The socialist countries know no crises or unemployment. Conversely, the leading capitalist country, the USA, has at present 11 million unemployed. Besides, planned economic development makes it possible to bridge the gap in the economic development of one socialist country or another and of the entire socialist community.

Socialism offers completely novel conditions for the development of democracy. Ever since the working people came to power and undertook social transformation, people in growing numbers have been involved in different sectors of socio-political life and in running the economy. For instance, about 2,200,000 people work in the Soviets of People's Deputies in the USSR helped by more than 31 million activists. About 40 million take part in production conferences at enterprises, with workers accounting for 65 per cent of them. Workers and peasants are also predominant in the Supreme Soviet, the highest body of state authority.

The national question was first solved on a scientific basis under socialism. Socialist society knows no "lower races" or racial discrimination. All nations and national groups get help in developing their economic resources as well as their literature and cultural traditions.

People's rule under socialism guarantees extensive rights for the citizens of all nationalities and religious beliefs. These include the right to work, rest and leisure, housing, free medical care and education, and maintenance in old age. It has already been mentioned that there are no unemployed in the socialist countries. Laws practised here guarantee that any citizen is given employment in the shortest possible time in accordance with his or her wish and production abilities. No working man can be dismissed without his wish and the consent of the trade union committee. Those illegally dismissed are reinstated with all the wages recompensed for the period of being without work.

Special measures are taken to give women a chance to work. To begin with, they are offered jobs in sectors with more favourable and prestigious types of work. A considerable number of women are engaged in the food industry, health service, education, the press, broadcasting, the TV and so on. Women do not have to work in the evening or at night.

Socialist society guarantees all citizens the right to rest and leisure. Work hours and weekly days-off are strictly regulated by laws. The Soviet Union, for instance, guarantees a 41-hour working week with two days-off. A shorter working day resulting in up to 30 work hours a week has been established for many vocations and industries. All the working people are annually given from 3 to 4 weeks of paid leave. Millions upon millions of people get vouchers to holiday homes, sanatoria, and tourist and sports centers, where they cape for their health, at a discourt or free of charge. Incidentally, under socialism concern is shown for man's health since the moment of his birth. Doctors and nurses closely follow children's growth in families, créches and nursery schools and keep an eye on the health of schoolchildren.

Concern for the people's health is also manifest in strict control over labour safety and the conditions of work, in environment protection, and in growing research to prevent and lessen diseases and to extend man's active life span. It should be added that individuals do not pay for all of this.

People are guaranteed low-rent housing, which also serves to provide better conditions for man's normal life. Annually millions of Soviet people move into new flats built by the state. Beginning with 1965 more than 2,200,000 flats have been built annually in the USSR.

Radical changes take place in culture under socialism. The dominant ideology calls for co-operation and mutual understanding among the working classes. Prior to the Great October Socialist Revolution three-fourths of Russia's population were illiterate. About 50 nations and nationalities had no written language of their own. By the 1970s every young boy and girl were receiving compulsory secondary education, and about 1,000,000 were graduating from universities and other higher educational establishments every year. Small wonder therefore that the USSR boasts a highly-developed science and technology. The country has made unique scientific and technological accomplishments by building the world's first atomic power plant, its first atomic device to desalinate water, its first atomic ice-breaker, and first man-made Earth satellite. The USSR was the first to launch a manned spaceship, the first to explore the North and South poles of our planet, the first to send a submarine under the ice of the Arctic Ocean, and the first to carry out a successful space-walk, while the craft was flying over our planet. These examples are numerous and not due to mere chance. Along with many other things, they are manifestations of the advantages of socialist society, as compared with other types of social organization.

Some important conclusions can be made from the foregoing. First, the state is not given from above as an organ of public order and its laws are not preordained by the "supreme mind" to be strictly observed by all the citizens.

The state came into being together with the emergence of classes and always represents the will and interests of the class ruling in a given society. All orders, decrees and activities of government offices, the courts, the army, the police and so on are nothing else, but the realization of the will of the ruling classes elevated to the rank of laws. The exploiter state is the machinery for one class to suppress another.

Second, history knows various forms of the state, each of which should be analyzed from class positions, from the point of view of its class essence. The state of workers and peasants is not the exploiter state.

Built by the working class, it serves the interests of all the working classes in general and, at a certain level of development, the interests of the whole people. When classes disappear, including the class of the world bourgeoisie and other exploiter classes, the state will also disappear. Just as people lived without the state and did fairly well without it at the lower stages of their development, they will live and do without the state in the future. Society and all its inhabitants will be mature and need no forms of coercion. Nevertheless it is only the socialist state, the state of the proletarian dictatorship, that facilitates the building of such society.

For these conditions to appear in any society, it is necessary to break the old, exploiter state and to replace it by the new, socialist state. The next chapter will discuss when and under what circumstances such a need arises.

## *Test Questions*

1. What is the state, how did it come into being and whose interests does it defend?
2. What are the main types and forms of the state? What are the distinctive features of the state in the developing countries?
3. What is the radical difference between the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the exploiter states?
4. What are the tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the instrument of the socialist revolution?
5. Is the state eternal?

*Chapter XI*

# SOCIAL REVOLUTIONS

Transition from one social formation to another and the replacement of one type of state by another take place only via *social revolution*. What is social revolution then? Who effects it, why and when? It is no easy matter to answer all these questions, as class, national and inter-state contradictions are closely intertwined in this historical phenomenon. Furthermore, the correlation of these elements constantly changes in the course of the revolution and different objective and subjective factors emerge, which even further complicates the matter. For this reason revolution, to quote Lenin, is indeed a wise, difficult and complicated science.

## 1. The Revolution: Its Motive Forces and Conditions for Carrying It Out

### The Concept of the Social Revolution

The social revolution is a qualitative leap in social development leading to the substitution of one, higher socio-economic formation for another. The entire social system—the mode of production, the social structure and society's cultural life—undergoes a radical change as a result of social revolution. Revolution is the kind of transformation that destroys the most essential part of the old.

Sometimes the term "social revolution" is used in a narrower sense, referring to the transfer of power from a reactionary class to a more advanced and progressive class. This phenomenon is usually called the *political revolution*. Social and political revolutions are interconnected but the social revolution implies a broader and deeper process than merely winning political power by a new class. Nevertheless, the main characteristic of any social revolution, its key issue is the question of winning state power. This determines the entire development of the revolution, its internal and external policies.

Bourgeois ideologists, as a rule, deny the law-governed nature of social revolutions and try to describe them as governed by historical chance, as a "disruption" of the historical process and a deviation from the "normal" evolutionary way of social development. Some people seriously believe that the social revolution takes place as a result of mistakes made by governments and political figures. In actual fact, however, social revolutions are historically law-governed and inevitable phenomena generated by the objective needs of social development, particularly, the need to resolve outstanding contradictions. The main reason and the economic basis of a social revolution is the conflict between the productive forces and production relations, which at a certain stage of the development of the productive forces begin fettering their development and obstructing social progress. There are certain classes behind production relations and therefore the conflict between the two aspects of production finds expression in the form of class contradictions and class struggle.

The fact that different classes participate in a social revolution does not mean that all of them are equally interested in it and that all of them are among its initiators. Understandably enough, the ruling classes have little interest in the revolutionary transformation of society. Therefore they act as a counter-revolutionary force in the social revolution. Who is then its active agent and what forces prepare it and carry it through?

Bourgeois propagandists assert that revolutions, especially socialist revolutions, are carried out to order from without and that they are "exported" from the communist countries. I believe there is no need to dispute these foolish assertions. Suffice it to ask them: and who "exported" the revolutions of the 17th-19th centuries when there were no communist countries? History has long shown that the social revolution in any form can only be caused by the people whose life conditions create an urgent need for a revolution. Victorious revolutions in one or several countries may give support to the working people of other countries fighting for their emancipation. But the victorious revolutions cannot and should not impose on others social transformations similar to the ones carried out by them. Attempts to "trigger" revolutions from the outside would have been just as senseless as attempts to speed up the growth of a plant by pulling at its top. That is why Lenin said that "people who believe that revolution can break out in a foreign country to order, by agreement ... are either mad or they are provocateurs".[1] One social system or another crumbles under the impact of a revolution not because somebody wants to seize power, but because its economic and political contradictions exacerbate and forces emerge called upon by the entire course of history to resolve them.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "Fourth Conference of Trade Unions and Factory Committees of Moscow, June 27-July 2, 1918. Reply to the Debate on the Current Situation, June 22, 1918", *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 480.

## The Motive Forces of Revolution

The motive forces of revolution are the revolutionary classes, which fight to overcome the resistance of the ruling classes, and effect the revolution.

Dialectical materialism has proved and historical practice confirmed that the composition of these forces depends on the nature of a given historical period, on the one hand, and the socio-class structure existing in one country or another, on the other.

When bourgeois revolutions occurred in the 17th-19th centuries, the bourgeoisie which was pivotal to that period, spearheaded and guided the revolutionary process. It was the bourgeoisie which solved democratic tasks because it was interested in winning the people over to its side. But the interests of the people were dissolved in the bourgeois nature of the revolution. That is why revolutions carried out under the ideological guidance of the bourgeoisie were nothing else but bourgeois democratic revolutions. As the needs of the development of productive forces were met only partially and only for a certain period in the course of these revolutions, new contradictions took shape in bourgeois society. Once in power, the bourgeoisie is no longer interested in resolving these contradictions in a revolutionary way because this would encroach upon its own economic and political interests. Only new forces, namely, the representatives of the classes that form the foundation of the productive forces, are capable of doing that.

The experience of the socialist revolution in Russia in October 1917, of the people's democratic revolutions in some European and Asian countries and in Cuba, and also of the national-democratic revolutions in some other countries has shown that the proletariat, the working class, is that representative which undertakes to defend the interests of other democratic strata of the population. This is explained by the fact that the proletariat is connected with large-scale mechanized production. It is united and taught discipline and organization by the very conditions of its labour in large-scale production. For this reason it is to a greater extent than any other class or section of the population capable of concerted, conscious and organized revolutionary actions. On the other hand, the proletariat is the most revolutionary force in capitalist society because it has no property it might be afraid to lose. Marx and Engels said that the proletariat had nothing to lose but its chains.

As the only consistently revolutionary class, the proletariat is not opposed to the rest of the working people. What is more, it strives after an alliance with other classes of the working people, above all the peasantry, as only the alliance between the workers and the peasants can bring about their victory over the capitalists.

At the same time the toiling peasantry benefits more from its alliance with the working class than from that with the bourgeoisie. The latter is not capable of a revolutionary transformation under imperialism. It is afraid of the proletariat and seeks to balk the revolutionary process. Only the proletariat allied with the peasantry is capable of carrying out the emancipation of the working classes and effecting the socialist revolution. In so doing the proletariat and its party seek not only alliance with the peasantry but advocate co-operation with the petty bourgeoisie and other middle strata in town (the intelligentsia and the students) and under certain circumstances with the liberal bourgeoisie.

This historical experience of the proletariat's co-operation with other democratic social strata is especially relevant nowadays to the former colonial periphery of the capitalist world, where the proletariat is only beginning to come into its own. These nations show increasing resolve in advocating a social restructuring of the world, imbuing the revolutionary process with their peculiar characteristics, will and passion. Prospects for the national liberation and national-democratic revolutions in the emergent states and their development along the lines of socialist orientation directly depend on the stand adopted by the peasantry, the petty urban bourgeoisie and the social strata associated with pre-feudal social structures (for instance, the nomads).

The national bourgeoisie does also participate in the national liberation movement along with the working people. In some countries it has spearheaded the people's struggle against colonialism. But it was the masses of the people—peasants, workers, craftsmen and intellectuals—which have formed the main motive force of all national liberation revolutions without exception.

Even when they were under the ideological and political sway of the bourgeoisie, these masses brought into the national liberation struggle their own aspirations, which, as a rule, were of an anti-feudal and anti-imperialist nature. The Soviet Union, other socialist countries and the revolutionary classes in the capitalist countries have always sided with these peoples, this being formalized in the slogan, "Workers of All Countries and Oppressed Nations, Unite! ", which was set forth by Marx, Engels and Lenin. It is also manifest in the diverse aid rendered to the national liberation movements by the working people of all the world and above all of the socialist countries.

## Objective Conditions and the Subjective Factor of Revolution

The presence of the motive forces of the revolution does not mean that it can take place any time and even less that it can always be victorious. *Objective conditions and the subjective factor* of the revolution have to be there before the revolution can take place, let alone emerge victorious. Among its objective conditions are the economic and socio-political prerequisites that take shape independently of the will of the people and political parties. It is a matter of, above all, the disproportion and antagonism between the new productive forces, on the one hand, and archaic, outdated production relations and the old reactionary political superstructure, on the other. Nevertheless, objective prerequisites in themselves do not automatically lead to the revolution. A *revolutionary situation* is indispensable for that. A revolutionary situation presupposes, first, the "crisis of the upper classes", of the policy of the ruling class, which is unable to govern society in the old way or maintain its rule by old methods; second, the worsened plight of the oppressed classes and their unwillingness to live in the old way and, third, the heightened activity of the masses and the realized desire of the oppressed classes to rid themselves of the exploiters' yoke.

This provides further confirmation of the fact that the social revolution is prepared by objective social development and objective conditions. At the same time, the revolution is carried out by people—classes, social groups and political parties acting consciously. For this reason it is not enough to have a revolutionary situation for the revolution to occur. A revolutionary situation in itself does not lead to the revolution. For objective conditions to "yield result", it is necessary to have the subjective factor, that is, the determination of the oppressed people, above all of the proletariat, to start storming the old system and to overthrow the reactionary government, which, though quite "shaky" in the period of exacerbated social contradictions, will not fall by itself until toppled.

The subjective factor of the revolution also includes the organization and discipline of the revolutionary forces, their consciousness and ideological preparedness, and lofty moral qualities, including staunchness and determination in struggle, revolutionary enthusiasm and ardour.

Furthermore, it includes the readiness of their allies to follow the vanguard and neutralize those who are undecided. All this is more often than not possible only when the oppressed people have their own party, and if the socialist revolution breaks out, are guided by a scientific theory, scientific sociology. Revolutionary experience has shown that in this case it is a Marxist-Leninist party.

Thus it is clear that for the social revolution to be a success it is necessary to have objective conditions, a revolutionary situation and a subjective factor. No revolution is possible in the absence of any of the three. The requirement of the unity of these conditions is the fundamental law of the revolution.

History knows many cases when in the presence of a revolutionary situation the revolution failed to take place because the subjective factor was absent. Consequently, when analyzing the questions of the revolution it is necessary to take into account some important points.

First, the moment when a revolutionary situation matures can be precisely determined only by the party that is strictly guided by the scientific Marxist-Leninist theory and takes into account the experience of the revolutionary struggle of the communist parties.

Second, while the revolutionary situation intensifies, the party should spearhead the political activity of the masses and lead them on in the necessary direction rather than lag behind the developments.

Third, the question of power is pivotal to any revolution. Hence the principal task of the democratic and socialist revolution is to establish the power of the working class allied with the peasants, the power of the working majority of the people.

Fourth, if the masses led by a revolutionary party let the opportunity slip, the unstable socio-political atmosphere during the period of a revolutionary situation can and does lead to the instalment of military-police regimes and sanguinary dictatorships by the reactionaries, as has been the case in some Latin American countries.

It is not enough to carry out a revolution, that is to overthrow the rule of the exploiter classes and to establish new rule in the interests of the working people. This rule has to be able to defeat the inevitable attempts by the reactionary forces to restore the old order. As Lenin emphasized, any revolution is worth its salt, only if it can defend itself.

In this way the revolution, as the law-governed result of social development, and the condition and prerequisite for the transition to a new social system, presupposes at the same time profound preparation on the part of the working people to carry it through. The political organization of the proletariat—a revolutionary party equipped with scientific ideology and capable of determining correctly the moment necessary to begin the revolution and to mobilize the broad mass of the people to carry it through—serves these purposes.

## 2. Historical Types of Social Revolutions

### The Concept of the Bourgeois and the Socialist Revolution

History knows different types of social revolutions whose nature is determined by the economic and political tasks fulfilled, the contradictions resolved and the social system established as a result. Accordingly, the *bourgeois and socialist* revolutions constitute the two most characteristic types of social revolution.

The bourgeois or bourgeois-democratic revolution is carried out by the class of the bourgeoisie and its parties and leads to the establishment of capitalism. The basic foundations of social life, especially economic and social foundations, are often not affected or are only insignificantly modified during a bourgeois revolution. This is explained by the fact that in the bourgeois type of revolution social and political transformations do not coincide in time: the capitalist economic system takes shape within mature feudal society, comes in to contradiction with the entire system of the old feudal superstructure and has only to carry through a political revolution, that is to transfer power from the reactionary class of the feudal lords to a more progressive class, the bourgeoisie.

The social revolution within feudal society is crowned with a new bourgeois system of the superstructure. That is why there is no special transition period between feudalism and capitalism: it takes place, as it were, within old feudal society and the bourgeois revolution has only to crown the matter by the transfer of power. It has already been mentioned that the working people get next to nothing as a result of such a revolution. As before, they remain the class of the exploited. Only the exploiters change and the forms of exploitation become somewhat subtler.

That is why bourgeois revolutions do not completely resolve the main contradiction between the productive forces and production relations bred by private property, are incapable of eliminating the causes of class struggle and only temporarily delay the need for their resolution. The mass of the working people and their revolutionary parties therefore make themselves ready for and act to promote the development of bourgeois or bourgeois-democratic revolutions into socialist revolutions. However, this requires the abolition of private property relations, which is something the bourgeoisie will, beyond doubt, be unwilling to do voluntarily. But if the bourgeoisie, which previously proclaimed "fraternity", "equality", "liberty", and so on, should have agreed to it, this transformation could occur in a peaceful way without any armed coercion. The working class and other working people are interested in precisely such a development. To quote Lenin, this would be "the easiest and the most advantageous course for the people", [1] the most painless course, which therefore should be vigorously promoted.

This course is possible in principle. At the same time practice shows that, to pass over to a society without exploitation, the working people have to take up arms and carry out a socialist revolution.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "On Slogans", *Collected Works,* Vol. 25, p. 187.

The socialist revolution is carried out by the working class in alliance with the peasants and the progressive intelligentsia led by a Marxist-Leninist party and results in the establishment of socialist social relations. The socialist revolution is the highest type of the social revolution, in which the latter does not come before the political revolution, but, on the contrary, starts unfolding only after the political revolution has been carried out by the proletariat in alliance with other working strata of the population. Bourgeois revolutions are limited in their economic and social consequences and merely replace one form of private property by another, whereas the socialist revolution puts an end to private ownership of the means of production and establishes a new form of property. Bourgeois revolutions only replace one form of exploitation by another, while the socialist revolution aims at ridding mankind of exploitation as such. That is why the bourgeois revolution does not even raise the issue of scrapping the old feudal state machine: the bourgeoisie gets hold of it and subordinates it to its interests. The key problem of the socialist revolution, on the contrary, is to destroy the old state machine.

The tasks of the revolution are not limited to the conquest of power by the working people. The socialist revolution sets itself the tasks that are immeasurably more complicated and far-reaching than those of non-socialist revolutions.

The conquest of political power therefore does not terminate but merely starts the revolution. The socialist revolution faces the grandiose task of transforming the whole of society, its economy and culture. At the same time if the socialist revolution takes place in countries inheriting economic backwardness from the old system (as was the case with the majority of countries now forming the world socialist system), the tasks of the socialist restructuring of the economy are complemented by the task of creating and developing large-scale industry, which constitutes the material and technical base of socialism.

Alongside economic transformation, the socialist revolution brings radical changes into culture. The development of new socialist culture, the education of the people's intelligentsia and the perfection of the entire system of ethical relations and the national system of education are some of the tasks of the cultural revolution, which is an indispensable part of the socialist revolution. In countries inheriting cultural backwardness this is compounded by the urgent need to raise the general cultural standards of the people (by the elimination of illiteracy, the introduction of universal education, etc.).

Whereas a political revolution can be carried out in a matter of several weeks, months, or years, the socialist restructuring of the economy takes much more time (it took the Soviet Union approximately twenty years to accomplish it after the victory in the October 1917 Revolution). And the cultural revolution is an even more protracted process. Its task is not to cast away the wealth of culture produced by mankind, including that bourgeois society, but to incorporate it. By critically assimilating the best of the cultural achievements of the past, the proletariat can create a socialist culture. The socialist revolution establishes conditions for the development of the creative abilities of each man, as a result of which the entire revolutionary practice is creative, constructive by nature. It puts an end to mankind's pre-history and ushers in the genuine history of liberated mankind, forming an entirely new type of civilization.

## The Class Essence and Characteristics of National-Democratic Revolutions

It is necessary to distinguish one more stage of the social revolution, namely, the national liberation revolution which is essentially designed to ultimately put an end to foreign rule and establish a regime supported by the majority of the people. Social and national liberation revolutions are closely interrelated: the elimination of colonial oppression is accompanied by progressive changes in the social development of a young independent state. That is why, even though national-liberation revolutions of different content and form have taken and still take place nowadays, some of them form part of the world revolutionary process and therefore acquire new prospects for development, without going beyond democratic social changes as far as their socio-economic content is concerned. For this reason they are different from the bourgeois revolutions. The term *national-democratic revolution* is used more and more frequently in scholarly writing and in statements made by leaders of the newly-free countries. Leaders of emergent states, such as Algeria, Burma, the Congo, Guinea, the South Yemen, Tanzania and some others, while describing the nature of the revolutionary transformation they carry out, emphasize that these states go through the national-democratic rather than the bourgeois (or bourgeois-democratic) revolution.

It is pertinent to ask in this context what the essence of the national-democratic revolution is. To answer this question, it is necessary to find out what classes carry this revolution through and with what aims. Class approach is central to the analysis of the essence and goals of any revolution. By using it, we can determine scientifically the essence of one revolution or another from a class point of view, precisely the way we defined earlier the socialist and the bourgeois revolution.

From the class point of view the national-democratic revolution differs from the bourgeois or bourgeois-democratic revolution in that the former is carried out under the guidance of revolutionary democracy, which is a socio-political bloc or party uniting the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and democratic forces. The national-democratic revolution is carried out not by the working class (it is still weak numerically in the developing countries), and, as a rule, without a Marxist-Leninist party.

The national-democratic revolution is the main revolutionary form of the developing countries' transition to socialism. It is carried out in two principal varieties: guided by revolutionary democracy (as exemplified by the majority of the countries of socialist orientation) or (less frequently) guided by a Marxist-Leninist party. In the latter case progressive changes are made in a more purposeful way and the time of transition from the national-democratic transformation to socialist development is shortened. Thus, for example, in Laos the national-democratic revolution won in 1975 and already by the late 1970s had grown over into the socialist revolution. The country directly set out to build a socialist society.

The socio-economic programme of the national-democratic revolution envisages the nationalization of large and medium-size private property (both foreign and local), the setling up and democratization of a strong state sector, progressive agrarian reform in the interests of the toiling peasants and with their direct participation, the elimination of illiteracy and the placing of health care within the reach of the people.

Needless to say, the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and anti-bureaucratic thrust of the national-democratic revolution with a socialist outlook evokes active resistance by internal reaction supported by the outside imperialist forces. All this interferes with the introduction of immediate radical changes in society and thus hinders the development of new society. That is why the revolutionary parties attach great importance to mobilizing the forces to crush counter-revolution and rebuff external reaction. Much depends in this respect on the development and strengthening of manifold relations with the socialist countries and on their practical support for the measures taken by the democratic government and the revolutionary party.

In this way the national-democratic revolution is a purposeful revolutionary process, which is carried out by the progressive forces of the developing countries and which creates socio-political, ideological, economic and cultural prerequisites for transition to socialism.

To sum up, social revolutions are the natural consequences of social development and class struggle in exploiter societies in the course of their entire history. Proletarian, socialist revolutions constitute the highest type of social revolutions. The Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia (1917) was the first victorious revolution of this type and a historical landmark in the 20th century. It ushered in a new epoch, the epoch of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism and of the struggle for liberation from imperialism, for terminating wars among nations, for the overthrow of the domination of capital and for socialism. The victory of the October Revolution opened up prospects for building a new, socialist society. As a result of similar revolutions in other countries the world socialist system was formed. The world revolutionary process is accelerated by the force of attraction of the October Revolution, and the world socialist system is now the center of the world revolutionary process. Progress made by the socialist countries in developing the economy, science and technology, culture, democracy, human rights and freedoms acts to speed up the revolutionary process. Struggle waged by the working class in the developed capitalist countries forms part of the world revolutionary process. The world working class is at the heart of the contemporary epoch, rallying around itself all the revolutionary forces.

The national liberation movement is an indispensable element in the development of today's revolutionary process; it is a natural ally of world socialism in the struggle against imperialism. In Asian and African states, which have chosen socialist orientation, the struggle for national liberation has actually started to grow into the struggle against exploiter relations.

In the past few years the world revolutionary process has been steadily mounting in scope and potential. The recent period alone has seen the historic reunification of the two parts of Vietnam, the victorious socialist revolutions in Laos and Ethiopia, the downfall of the monarchic regime in Iran, the people's democratic revolution in Afghanistan, the victory of the forces of socialism and democracy in Kampuchea and the toppling of fascist regimes in Spain and Greece. A democratic revolution has been carried out in Portugal, the Nicaraguan dictatorial regime has been overthrown and the revolutionary struggle is mounting in El Salvador and Namibia. People on all continents and in all regions, where exploiter social relations still exist, increasingly strive to see radical changes and, wherever objective and subjective preconditions appear, they take up arms and join the revolutionary struggle. The imperialists move their forces from one region into another, in a bid to stifle revolutions. But all their efforts are futile. It is impossible to reverse the objective historical process, just as it is impossible to cancel the operation of objective laws of social development.

## *Test Questions*

1. What is a social revolution?
2. What types of social revolutions do you know?
3. What are the characteristic features of national-democratic revolutions?
4. What basic laws of social revolutions do you know?

## *Chapter XII*

# HISTORICAL FORMS OF SOCIAL COMMUNITY

The development of human society is hampered by national as well as class oppression. Racial and even clan, tribal and national contradictions often disrupt society, as do class contradictions. The division of people according to national and ethnic characteristics commonly leads to their being unable to understand their present and future social position. Not infrequently, national and tribal contradictions emerge as a factor causing fratricidal wars. The exploiting classes use nationalism, tribalism and racism to disunite and antagonize the working people and to undermine their solidarity in the struggle for liberation. The exploiters resort to the "defend the nation" slogan to mobilize other classes in defence of their own, exploiter interests. They use ,the "national unity" slogan in an attempt to conceal class differences, to smooth over the class struggle and to preserve their privileges intact. All these and other circumstances necessitate a more detailed examination of the historical forms of social community.

## 1. What Are a Clan, Tribe, Nationality and Nation? How Did They Come into Being?

Each socio-economic formation is characterized by a definite *historical form of social community*. The term "historical forms of community" refers to stable associations of people whose interrelationships are determined, first and foremost, by the objective conditions of their existence and development. The existence of such associations is explained by the fact that people deal with nature and produce the necessities of life not alone but in groups, in communities. Though essential differences, conditioned by the levels of production development, characterize these groups, or communities, at various stages of history, all of them are forms of social community.

These forms include the *clan, tribe, nationality, nation, and an international socialist entity that is arising in the present-day period*.

Various forms of social community began to take shape at the dawn of mankind's history, in primitive society.

History shows that the development of social community proceeded from the clan to the tribe, from the tribe to the nationality, and from the nationality to the nation. The clan and the tribe are therefore the most ancient forms of social community.

*The Clan*. Initially membership of a clan was determined along the maternal line (matriarchy), but later matriarchy gave way to patriarchy. The predominant position in a clan of the woman, and then of the man, stemmed from their respective roles in the life of a clan. Initially, with the existence of mixed marriages in a clan, the children knew only their mother, who was also the main keeper of the hearth, managed the household and distributed food. This determined the leading role of the woman in a clan, while the other members were merely more or less efficient workmen. But as labour productivity rose and man's role in the survival of a clan became greater, the woman ceded leadership to the man.

The clan is characterized by:

1) the existence of a relatively well-defined territory within which food is gathered and a proper round of migration is made and which is protected from intruders;

2) a ban on sexual relations between parents and children, brothers and sisters, grandchildren and greatgrandchildren, i.e., a ban on marriages between kin;

3) the fact that the entire clan owns the land, runs its economy in common and distributes food among its members;

4) mutual guarantee, blood revenge, ancestral cult, common religious rites and common burial grounds;

5) the fact that the clan was headed by a council, a democratic assembly of all its adult members, men and women alike, having equal voting rights.

Inasmuch as the ban on marrying one's kin called for the selection of wife or husband from outside one's clan, i.e., from among members of another clan, all clans did not exist in isolation but were linked in couples, forming specific systems. Each of these systems consisted of mutually marrigeable clans. In the course of evolution, several clans linked by bonds of kinship began to form tribes.

*The Tribe*. The tribe is a bigger community of people than the clan. It consisted of two or more clans. The material base of a tribe was a primitive form of production characterized by the joint ownership of work implements, dwellings and consumer products. Because of the low level of the development of the productive forces the socio-economic links within tribes were extremely underdeveloped. At the same time the tribe had what is known as primitive democracy.

To deal with questions of utmost importance (such as of war and peace, etc.), the entire tribe held an assembly, which was vested with supreme power. All arguments and misunderstandings were resolved collectively by the body of people concerned, the clan or tribe. All problems were tackled by the people who were involved in them. All members of a tribe were equal and free, women included. And this freedom and equality were maintained without soldiers, police, nobles, vicegerents, judges or jails—in short, without the state. Consequently, tribal democracy, simple as it was, was quite full and just. At the same time even at those early stages there emerged leaders, priests and military chiefs together with such control bodies as a tribal council, who were to ensure a more effective guidance of a tribe alongside the general assembly of all its soldiers and adult members. This proved to be the first step in the separation of power from the people. However, since both the tribe and the clan were unable to overcome consanguineous ties, had one name and language, and observed common religious rites, this separation of leaders, priests and military chiefs was insignificant.

The clan-and-tribal form of community was the only possible form of the functioning and development of social being at that time. It offered considerable scope for the development of economic activities and primitive culture and promoted the consolidation of people and the evolution of language. This explains both the existence of this form in all peoples at a low stage of the development of the productive forces and its survival for many thousands of years, up to the present day in some places. Nevertheless, tribal community hampered social progress: the existence of consanguineous ties restricted the numerical growth of groups and impeded communication, in particular, the migration of people and the development of economic relations. Though facilitating the functioning of the social organism, the traditions of tribal society prevented the introduction of any social changes and the introduction of new elements of culture, morals and so on. As a result objective contradictions emerged between the needs of the productive forces and the tribal mode of life.

Worsening contradictions in the clan and tribal organization and the need for broader economic contacts and cultural exchanges first led to the formation of unions of tribes and later to the emergence of a new type of community, the nationality.

*The Nationality*. The nationality is a historical community of people in class society. Nationalities began to arise during the disintegration of the primitive-communal social order as a result of the development of the productive forces and the appearance of private property and property inequality. Society split into classes, and the state came into being, changing radically social ties between people.

Under these conditions the differentiation of the tribe took place, among other things, and consanguineous ties, formerly a key factor in a social group, broke up. In primitive society, members of a clan or a tribe shared a common territory. With the emergence of private property and classes, the development of trade and the sale of land, etc., people belonging to different clans and tribes began to intermix. Clans moved out of isolation, while consanguineous ties ceased to be a prerequisite of social organization. With the increasing intermingling of people distinctions between clans and tribes are obliterated, they form a single people and no longer exist as separate entities.

The nationality is not merely a tribal union but an amalgamation of tribes in which they merge together, shaking off their self-management and isolation. Their lands are joined to form one territory, and the entire population of merged tribes is managed as a single whole. Though tribal dialects continue to exist for a long time, the nationality gradually develops a common language. Language is the most stable feature of a nationality. The nationality has its own economic base, though in the absence of a common market, it still lacks sufficiently stable economic ties. The nationality is a community of people of the pre-capitalist epoch; pre-capitalist economic relations, for instance, feudal relations of production, are characterized by fragmentation, which accounts for the disunity within any given people.

The nationality also has a common mentality, character traits, tastes and traditions evolved under the influence of common conditions during its development. For instance, clear thinking, staunch character, endurance, reasonable patience, optimistic attitude towards life and respect for other people are characteristic of Pushtuns; wit, valour, dignity, industriousness and perseverance in attaining goals set, hospitality and respect for other peoples distinguish the Tajiks and the Hazaras. As a matter of fact, every people, by preserving their best traditions and censuring improper customs and qualities, develop with time worthy moral and psychological qualities. Their invaluable cultural and ethical norms and personal virtues deserve all possible respect. Specific features of character, psychology or morals of one people or another cannot justify some people's sense of superiority over another or point to any significant differences between peoples. All these individual features reflect but different objective conditions in which our ancestors lived, are vestiges of the past traditions. Changes in the economic and social conditions make these special features, the best traits and characteristics the endowment of all people who communicate with one another, and as a result all significant differences between them are obliterated. In referring to a nationality as a people one should bear in mind that the term "people" is broader in meaning than "nationality". The word "people" is used to denote both a nationality, as in the Tajik people, the Uzbek people and the people of Pushtunistan, etc., and yet one would say the Afghan people to denote the Afghan nation. The term "people" also conveys a social meaning. In class society, for example, one distinguishes between the people and the feudal lords, the bourgeoisie, and rich traders, who separate themselves from the people, treat its representatives with contempt and exclude themselves from the "populace". Representatives of the exploiting classes are not part of the people, they fight against the people and are, in effect, an anti-popular force.

*Races*. Nationalities should not be confused with races, as is typical of bourgeois sociology and politics. Racial features are anthropological and ethnical characteristics of people unrelated to forms of social community and social ties. A single people may include representatives of different races (the Afghan people, for example, include representatives of the white and yellow races) and, similarly, different tribes and peoples can belong to one and the same race (for example, the Japanese, the Chinese and the Koreans).

The race is a natural community of people possessing the same physical features. Mankind is one species; races are subspecies.

Races are groups of people characterized by:

1. specific body structure (body proportions, form of head, height, colour of skin and eyes, texture and colour of hair, etc.).

2. geographical distribution.

The whole of mankind traces its origin back to the same ancestors. Racial variations came into being as a result of diverse geographical conditions in which people lived and to which they adapted. Thus, skin pigmentation depends on the amount of the sun radiation, air humidity and wind. Consequently, people with dark skin are found in the hottest areas of the globe, where a great deal of sunshine and high humidity are conducive to extensive pigmentation in skin. These people also have curly hair, which protects skin from direct sun rays and at the same time allows free access for air to it.

People with yellow skin and dark hair are predominant in areas with less sun radiation but long spells of hot weather.

In the North, where the sun radiation is several times less than in the torrid zone, people have light skin and often light hair.

The climate, natural food, elevation above sea level and other geographical factors similarly condition the average height of people. People of lower stature predominate in areas with more difficult conditions for human habitation, whereas in more favourable conditions people tend to be taller.

The division of mankind into races is purely a matter of convention. Therefore different grounds are used for the classification of races and their number ranges from 3 to 150. The French scientist, Georges Cuvier (1769-1832), divided mankind into three races—white, black and yellow—depending on the colour of skin. Other scientists distinguished from 60 to 150 races.

The reasons for such divergent views are that racial characteristics, though insignificant in terms of man's nature, are many, and each one of them can be used as a basis for the division of mankind into races, which leads to arbitrary classifications and their multitude. Another reason lies in attempts by some bourgeois anthropologists to explain social differences between peoples by biological dissimilarities. Thus they claim biological inferiority as the root of the social underdevelopment of some peoples.

German anthropologists Hans Günther, Alfred Rosenberg and others, for example, attempted to classify mankind into higher and lower races, alleging that such a division was ruled by nature. Proceeding from this premise, they postulate the inability of certain races to develop culturally due to their biological characteristics. It was the colonial peoples above all who were relegated to the lower races and, according to these pseudo-scientific racist concepts, these peoples should always remain in a subordinate position, where they can be led and governed. The theory postulating the division of peoples into higher and lower races is but a pseudo-scientific justification of colonialism and imperialism and, not surprisingly, it emerged at the time of the establishment of colonial powers, which engaged in numerous wars to subjugate other peoples and seize their lands. Yet the ideologists of imperialism depicted and continue to depict these wars of plunder as a manifestation of imperialism's civilizing mission among peoples who lagged behind in their development. Furthermore, these theories are used to justify neocolonialism.

The concept of the biological inequality of races is a myth. The whole of mankind has common origin, and all people are similar in their anatomical and physiological characteristics. As for such differences as the colour of skin, used for the division of mankind into races, they are insignificant.

## The Nation

But let us return to the forms of social community. Nationalities took shape on the basis of the class relations of production, which replaced primitive-communal relations. Being more developed social communities than tribes, nationalities contributed to progress in production, the accumulation and exchange of production experience and cultural values, the development of language and all other forms of communication between people in rather extensive territories with populations of tens and even hundreds of thousands. With time, however, this form of community also proved too limited for the development of the production of material wealth and for exchanges. Transition to the capitalist mode of production was accompanied by the elimination of the scattering of the means of production, property and population, by the concentration of the population and by the consolidation of the means of production in the hands of an ever smaller group of owners. This, in turn, led to political centralization: formerly autonomous areas, that is, areas whose populations formed individual nationalities linked to one another only as allies, found themselves united in a higher form of community, one with single production, the same laws, one name and language, the same interests, and common borders. This higher form of social community is called the nation.

The nation is a historically evolved and stable community of people having a common name, language, territory and economic life, as well as certain other common psychological and cultural traits.

Economic conditions play a decisive part in the formation and development of a nation. Under feudalism the life of a nationality or a principality was marked by economic seclusion and disunity. In such a situation a people cannot become a nation. Thus, individual tribes and even nationalities in Afghanistan do not yet form a single nation. The Afghan people is becoming a nation through economic unification and the development of a single and centralized economy.

The centralization of society's political system is another factor in the formation and development of a nation. The establishment of a single national state promotes greater economic and cultural unity among the population. It also regulates relations between nationalities and classes. But the state as such is not the determinant of a nation. There exist nations which do not yet have statehood.

The development of a nation is strongly influenced by its culture, national consciousness and socio-psychological traits.

The above equally applies to the principle of common territory and language. Without a common language, which is an instrument for the exchange of ideas, for mutual understanding and concerted activity by people, there can be no production, and without production there can be no human society as such. At the same time peoples speaking the same language do not always form a single nation, especially if they live in different territories (for example, the British and the Americans); no nation can arise without a shared territory since it is one of the objective conditions for the consolidation of peoples into nations.

Hence the conclusion: it takes a common economic and political life, common name, language and territory, and common psychological make-up in their totality to form a nation. None of the above features taken separately is enough to create a nation.

Bourgeois ideologists and all sorts of revisionists are apt to reduce the concept of nation to psychological features and a common language alone. A nation, they allege, is a union of like-minded people speaking the same language, in other words, a cultural community of a group of modern people not necessarily tied to any definite territory. A nation is thus regarded as a totality of people linked together by common character stemming from their common destiny.

These definitions of the nation take into account only national consciousness, while completely ignoring such objective material features as economic ties and common territory, that is, the determining factors of the formation of any nation.

They are obviously a case of pure idealism of the kind that is used by reactionaries in hatching their far-reaching plans. Bourgeois scholars exploit these ideological premises in a bid to conceal the division of society into classes. They would like to replace the concept of class with that of nation to be able to blunt peoples' class awareness and to avoid class struggle. Thus, the German Nazis asserted that there were no classes in Germany but only the German nation, destined by history to dominate other nations. Likewise, ideologues of American imperialism today seek to convince people that there are no classes in America, just a single American nation of democratic capitalism. In this manner they try to oppose what they call class unity to class struggle.

The same technique is used by all sorts of counter-revolutionaries. Former feudal lords and merchants, who in the past ruthlessly exploited their people, disregarding them and even disclaiming any affinity with them, begin to appeal,now that the peoples have overthrown them, to national sentiment in order to rally the working masses for the struggle against the popular system and the true friends of the liberated countries. But the working people throughout the world are aware that the feudal lords and the bourgeoisie call for national unity only when their interests, their property or their personal survival are in jeopardy. In such conditions they tend to pass their own problems off as those of general national significance. In a different situation, however, they not only ignore the interests of their nation but, in effect, betray them for the sake of personal gains. The present times offer numerous examples of direct betrayal of national interests by the feudal lords and the bourgeoisie. No one should forget that modern nations of exploiting society comprise different classes between which there is and can be no unity, and that not every class can truly express the interests of its nation. Only the working classes can speak on behalf of an entire nation because they alone are the true makers of their national material and spiritual wealth, because they form the majority, and because they can see when the genuine interests of a nation are at stake and when the exploiters attempt to utilize national sentiment in their own selfish interests and to the detriment of national interests.

National interests should not be opposed to class interests. A class is a community which is characterized by a common economic position, common vital interests and ideology. Quite different from an exploiter society nation, which is a heterogeneous organism torn apart by the struggle of antagonistic classes, each one with a different position and different interests and ideology. Genuine national unity and the accompanying flourishing of a nation are possible only in a society composed of homogeneous and friendly classes, namely, of working rather than of antagonistic classes. As this question is of special importance at present, let us consider in greater detail the cardinal difference of national relations under capitalism and socialism.

## 2. National Relations Under Capitalism and Socialism. The Future of Nations

As a historically evolved community of people, a nation has its beginning and end. Changes in and the development of nations are determined by economic and political factors and radical turns in social life.

Two historical types of nation emerged in the course of social development—bourgeois nations, which exist in capitalist society, and socialist nations, which came into being following the victory of socialism in the USSR and which have taken or are taking shape in European and Asian countries building socialism.

### Nations and the Characteristics of National Relations under Capitalism

Nations which were formed in the period of nascent capitalism were bourgeois nations. This is due to the fact that the overcoming of economic disunity, the setting up of economic and cultural centers and the drawing of isolated sections of the population together to form a single whole were all accomplished under the aegis of the bourgeoisie.

The nature of all those transformations was, understandably, in strict accordance with the nations, wishes and interests of the bourgeoisie. Indeed, bourgeois nations are noted for a specific socio-political and spiritual make-up, bearing an imprint of the economic and class system of capitalist society. Capitalism is based on private property, which engenders antagonistic classes rent by irreconcilable contradictions. Accordingly, similar contradictions corrode nations in capitalist society. The spiritual make-up of bourgeois nations is characterized by national isolation, distrust, fear and enmity vis-à-vis other nations, the suppression of national minorities, the striving for domination, the conquering of other nations, the seizure of their territories and the subsequent plundering of their national wealth. Moreover, the exploiter classes, the bourgeoisie are exponents of national animosity and oppression.

Nationalism is the bourgeoisie's reactionary ideology and policy of fomenting enmity between nations with a view to ensuring imperialist domination according to the divide-and-rule principle.

Bourgeois nationalism is rooted in the pseudo-scientific racial theory, which divides people into higher and lower nations, and in doctrines justifying the domination of lower nations by higher. While opposing bourgeois nationalism, dialectical materialism does not deny that at certain stages of national liberation movements the nationalism of an oppressed nation is a programme of national renascence and an ideology and policy of struggle against imperialism, for political and economic independence, for sovereignty and an all-round development of that nation. Dialectical materialism approves nationalism with such a general democratic content, and proponents of this philosophy support it wherever and whenever such content is present. But they do not forget for a moment about the forces whose allegiance to the general democratic struggle is only temporary and who are prepared to betray their nation's genuine interests.

The reverse of nationalism is cosmopolitanism, which is widespread in the USA. Cosmopolitanism advocates renouncement of one's home country's interests, national independence and sovereignty. Under the banner of cosmopolitanism American imperialism strives to dominate the world and to create what is known as an Atlantic commonwealth of peoples under the leadership of the American bourgeoisie.

The period of the decline of feudalism and the establishment of capitalism saw the emergence of mostly one-nation states. Further evolution of capitalism, however, is marked by the establishment of multinational imperialist states and the turning of several independent countries and nations into dependents. This was how imperialist colonial systems were built by Britain, France, the United States, Belgium, the Netherlands, and several other countries, and some nations began to dominate other nations (they continue to do so even today in some areas).

By analyzing such phenomena, Lenin discovered the *universal law of the development of nations under capitalism*. The essence of this law lies in the unity of two mutually related and antagonistically contradictory tendencies of social development. One of them can be described as the awakening and formation of nations and national relations and the struggle against national oppression and for the establishment of national statehood (the tendency of self-consolidation of a nation). This tendency is reflected in the ideology of bourgeois nationalism. The other tendency is revealed in the emergence, development and extension of relations between nations, the break-up of national barriers, and the developing international unity of capital and of economic life as a whole, as well as of politics, science and so on. The former tendency predominates at the early stages of capitalist development; the latter is characteristic of imperialism, which is mature capitalism. This tendency forcefully manifests itself at present in the expansion of the economic and, in some areas, political domination of backward and developing nations by the most powerful capitalist ones. However, in the developing countries both these tendencies are observed concurrently.

On the one hand, imperialist national oppression stirs these countries into national liberation wars and revolutions to protect their national sovereignty and self-awareness and in this way promotes the emergence and consolidation of nations. During such periods national sentiment, a sort of an oppressed nation's nationalism, acquires the dimension of a programme of national revival, an ideology and policy of opposing imperialism and ensuring political and economic independence. Marxism-Leninism considers this variety of nationalism, imbued with general democratic content, historically justified. On the other hand, the national liberation movement is inseparable from the world revolutionary process as a whole and from the establishment and development of close international ties with the socialist countries and the entire international revolutionary movement. In this process, extreme nationalism hinders the ultimate success of the peoples' national liberation struggle and the winning of a final victory over external and internal reactionaries. Because of this nations, which have liberated themselves from the yoke of imperialism, have at present different socio-economic objectives expressed in five principles of international relations: equality of nations, respect for national sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs, development of mutually beneficial relations, and peaceful coexistence. The growth of the objective conditions for non-capitalist development is accompanied by changes in the conditions in which nations develop.

Bourgeois nations will continue to exist as long as capitalism exists and will cease to exist when capitalism is eliminated.

It follows from the above that "nationalism" and a "nationalistic" course are not equivalent to the concepts "nation" and "national". The concept "national" refers to the entire domain of relations between all ethnic communities in society. All classes have to take into account national features, and all of them are involved in national relations and take their specific stand on the national question. Nationalism is a bourgeois policy, bourgeois ideology, and a bourgeois world outlook in approaching the national question.

## Nations and National Relations under Socialism

Proletarian socialist internationalism is opposite to bourgeois nationalism. It is an expression of the essential policy, world outlook and ideology of the working class as regards the national question. The victorious Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia offered a new type of relations between people and a new stage in the development and destinies of nations. Having smashed the chains of national oppression in Russia, the Revolution enabled the liberated nations to develop their national statehood, economy and culture. All this was made possible because, while socialism was being built, nations and their socio-political and spiritual make-up underwent a radical reshaping and new socialist nations arose from the ruins of the old bourgeois nations. The new socialist nations of the Soviet Union, such as the Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Kazakh, Uzbek and Tajik nations, differ fundamentally from the respective nations in old Russia in their class composition and economic basis, in their socio-political aspirations and interests, and in their spiritual make-up.

The dictatorship of the proletariat serves as a political basis for the formation of new socialist nations.

The dictatorship of the proletariat proclaimed and has consistently ensured the equality and sovereignty of peoples and their right to self-determination to the point of secession and the formation of independent states, the abolition of all national privileges and restrictions and the free development of national minorities and ethnic groups.

The Soviet state became a multinational state based on the equality of all peoples and nations and their voluntarily forming in 1922 a single state union, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The socialist mode of production, relying on the public ownership of the means of production, is the economic foundation for the formation of new socialist nations under socialism. Private property divides people and is a source of class as well as national oppression, of exploitation and enmity among peoples. Conversely, socialist property brings people together and provides the groundwork for co-operation and accord among nations. The unification and drawing closer together of peoples under socialism proceeds harmoniously alongside the strengthening and development of the independence of the Soviet national republics. The socialist mode of production creates an objective basis for a greater cohesion among nations and the consolidation of the multinational Soviet state. The striving for unity naturally arises in peoples who have public ownership of property because in this unity lie the main sources of their mutual economic, political and cultural assistance. The unification of individual Soviet republics in a single state made it possible to effectively utilize the principle of planning inherent in the socialist economy, to pool all economic resources, to effect the rational distribution of the productive forces and to achieve more rapid economic progress in backward nations, which would enable them to reach socialism without going through the stage of capitalism and at the same time as the more advanced nations, and to defend the revolutionary gains from encroachments by internal and external reaction.

Proletarian internationalism is the ideological foundation for establishing and developing socialist nations. Proletarian internationalism took shape under capitalism. Capital is an international force; therefore, an international alliance and fraternity of workers is necessary to defeat it. Marx and Engels conveyed this idea in their call, "Workers of All Countries, Unite! " After the victory of the socialist system, proletarian internationalism became the banner for those who deal with the economic, political and cultural tasks facing socialist nations.

The process of building socialism was accompanied by the cultural revolution, as a result of which Soviet culture, which is socialist in content and national in form, was developed and a new social layer, the socialist, people's intelligentsia, emerged. The socialist nations are the most educated nations in the world. The cultural revolution implemented in the Soviet Union had the most beneficial effect on the life of the peoples of the Soviet East. Let us take the Kazakh people as an example. Virtually all Kazakhs were illiterate before the Revolution, with the majority of the population engaged in nomadic cattle-breeding. There were no schools, to say nothing of higher educational establishments, in Kazakhstan's provinces, and no Kazakh was trained as a doctor, engineer or agronomist.

Today Kazakhstan is a Soviet republic of complete literacy. Almost 3,500,000 pupils attend its 10,000 general education schools, in addition to which there are more than 400 secondary vocational and over 200 specialized secondary schools as well as 49 higher educational institutions in the republic. Kazakhstan now has its own Academy of Sciences and a large number of research centers. Similar results have been attained in the other Soviet socialist republics that make up the great Union of Soviet nations.

Radical changes occurred in the socio-political aspirations and the spiritual make-up of the socialist nations. Emancipated from class antagonisms, they maintain moral and political cohesion, greater mutual trust, friendship and co-operation. In terms of socio-political orientation, they aspire to live in friendship and peace with other nations, respect their sovereignty and independence, and develop international co-operation and mutual assistance. The socialist nations hate war. The idea of peaceful coexistence and competition between states with different social systems is firmly rooted in the minds of the socialist nations. Thus any propaganda on behalf of racial and national exclusiveness or of war is considered a punishable criminal offence in the Soviet Union.

The socialist nations are therefore more consolidated and possess greater vitality then the bourgeois nations because they are free from the irreconcilable class contradictions which are eroding the bourgeois nations.

## What Is the Future of Nations?

It will be recalled that each historical community of people is in the process of developing and has its own history. The product of bourgeois society, bourgeois nations are transformed into socialist ones as society develops, progressing towards socialism. Socialism creates new conditions for the development of nations and national relations, as a result of which nations are flourishing.

The reason for this is that the two tendencies in the development of nations under socialism differ fundamentally both in form and content from tendencies intrinsic in the development of nations under capitalism. The renascence and development of nations and nationalities proceeds not in the context of the antagonistic bourgeois economy and antagonistic social contradictions, as is the case under capitalism, but alongside the emergence and development of new, just economic and social relations and the domination of a new ideology, new morals, and a new culture, in other words, the domination of social consciousness, which is socialist in content.

The elimination of national oppression and the establishment of equal rights for all peoples together with rendering mutual assistance and overcoming the economic and cultural plight of peoples, who have lagged behind in their development, create all the necessary conditions for the flourishing of socialist nations.

In this way the first tendency in the development of nations leads to their flourishing under socialism. But what does this "flourishing of a nation" mean? It signifies above all that a nation achieves the highest level in the development of its national economy, culture, morality, ideology and social psychology and assimilates all values accumulated by other peoples, in fact, by human civilization as a whole. But when other nations, too, reach these heights of world culture they become similar in all respects: in world outlook, nature of their culture, views of the norms of economic, social, moral and other relations. If, for example, Marx, Engels and Lenin, representatives of the German and the Russian nations, succeeded in creating a genuine masterpiece of scientific philosophy, sociology and political economy, which is of universal value and a triumph of world culture, it is clear that anyone who masters this teaching will, irrespective of his or her nationality, have share views with every other proponent of this theory, with all the people who have assimilated the general human values of world culture. The internationalism inherent in Marxism-Leninism makes internationalists out of all those who sincerely follow its precepts. Other masterpieces in different fields of human culture acquire the same universal significance. The famous ten-volume poem *Shah Namah* (The Book of Kings) by the Persian and Tajik poet Firdausi (940-1030) is admired not only in his native land but around the world. Russians, Tajiks, Afghans, Byelorussians, Bulgarians and Chuvashes all read it with equal pleasure. No one today can imagine developed culture without Tolstoy, Gorky, Hemingway, Picasso, Mann, Mozart and many others. This is to say that the greater the development of a nation the more it approaches the level of another similarly developing nation. In other words, given certain social conditions, all nations are drawing closer together. This process constitutes the other tendency in the development of the socialist nations. The drawing together or even merger to a certain extent of nations under socialism is the result of their flourishing rather than of the subjugation and oppression of one nation by another, as is the case with the bourgeois nations. Because of this the tendencies characterizing the development of nations under socialism do not contrast each other, as under capitalism, but complement one another and their progress is marked by ever growing harmony. The development of the socialist nations is based on their drawing together and this process is governed by their development and flourishing. The tendency of the drawing of nations together, embodied in socialist internationalization has a leading one. It is internationalization that provides the groundwork for the free development and flourishing of the socialist peoples. The process of internationalization is promoted by the increasingly integrated socialist production and the greater cohesion of new society's culture. The entire course of social life under socialism leads towards greater unity of nations because it fosters an ever more profound interconnection of economic, political and cultural life.

The flourishing of nations in a socialist state and their drawing closer together lead to the emergence of *a new historical community of people, a socialist people.* This historical community has at present come into being in the Soviet Union and it is called accordingly the Soviet people. The Soviet people is not a "super nation" but a new social and international community of people. Its basis is the socio-economic, ideological and political unity of the Soviet socialist nations and nationalities. This community has one and the same Motherland, territory, economy, political system, Marxist-Leninist world outlook and culture.

The process of overcoming national differences will now take place in the context of this new historical community. Further development of the world system of socialism will open the way to national unification of the peoples of many countries advancing along the road to socialism. Even today there exist objective tendencies for the unification of the economic, political and spiritual life of the socialist community of countries, which contributes to the drawing together of the socialist nations of these countries. In the future, after the triumph of communism, the all-round unification of nations will gradually eliminate national differences.

Such is the future of nations; such is the real scientific basis for a successful solution of the national question, which was engendered by capitalism, and a consistent implementation of the principles of proletarian, socialist internationalism.

### *Test Questions*

1. What is a "historical form of social community" and what forms of community do you know?
2. How have nations come into being and what are the two types of nations now existing in the world?
3. What two tendencies in the development of nations and national relations operate under capitalism?
4. What two tendencies in the development of nations and national relations operate under socialism and what is their essence?
5. What awaits nations in the future?

*Chapter XIII*

# SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS: ITS STRUCTURE AND FORMS

So far we have been mostly concerned with the objective foundations and the material conditions determining social development. But at the same time, all social phenomena to one extent or another are characterized by cultural and intellectual factors, in particular, social consciousness, that also have a certain role to play. In analyzing the laws governing the development of social life, it is therefore necessary to define the role of certain components of social consciousness in social phenomena and processes. A study of problems of social consciousness makes it possible to understand the reasons for the emergence and the laws of development of the intellectual life of society and the role it plays in inculcating one particular world outlook or another among the people.

What then is social consciousness?

## 1. Social Ideology and Social Psychology and Their Class Essence

*Social consciousness* is a complicated system of feelings, views, ideas and theories reflecting social being and characteristic of one large social group of people or another, of one type of society or another during a certain historical period. Social consciousness should be differentiated from man's individual consciousness. Speaking about social consciousness it is necessary to disregard all individual and personal features, and to focus on views and ideas characteristic of a certain social group or society as a whole.

At the same time individual and social consciousness have a lot of intrinsically common features because both are the result of the reflection of material processes. In the same way as individual consciousness reflects *material being*, social consciousness reflects *social being*.

Social being refers to society's material life, above all, the production of material wealth. At the same time it also includes other types of activities and in a broad sense the people's *mode of life* in general. This means that *social being* is a fairly complicated phenomenon. It includes multifaceted social practice and different types of material relations between classes, social groups and individuals.

By taking part in this practice and entering different social relations, people develop most diverse material needs. These needs are manifest in people's feelings. They are apprehended by people and give birth to interests, that is, aspirations and the desire to satisfy the requirements. Man develops certain needs depending on his vocation, his part in material relations and the class he belongs to.

People have social consciousness because in the course of life and diverse practical activity social being develops in them not only material but also cultural and intellectual requirements including:

1) *political* (to defend or change the economic basis);

2) *legal* (to preserve social inequality or establish equality);

3) *ethical* (to conserve public wealth and to surmount the contradictions between personal and public interests);

4) *aesthetic* (to produce perfect, beautiful products and works of art capable of shaping people's spiritual world);

5) *religious* (to attain illusory freedom from the blind forces of nature and society), and other needs.

In accordance with these needs different forms of social consciousness take shape and develop.

The complex structure of social being accounts for the complex structure of social consciousness which therefore has not only different *forms* but also different levels.

Different socio-economic formations have different forms of social consciousness, including political, legal, ethical or moral, cultural and scientific, religious and philosophical consciousness.

As far as the *levels* are concerned, social consciousness is divided into *everyday consciousness* and *theoretical consciousness.*

*Everyday consciousness* includes social psychology and empirical views. *Social psychology* is made up of different feelings, experiences, attitudes, ideals and interests, in which people's needs are manifest. *Empirical views* are the people's everyday ideas of different social phenomena, for instance, property, classes, and the state, their assessment of events, and public opinion. People set themselves different goals and tasks in their daily activities on the basis of everyday knowledge (correct and incorrect) of life and their interests.

Everyday consciousness is limited because all these ideals of the people, their interests, views and value judgements are superficial and fail to reveal, say, the reasons behind the emergence of private property, classes and states and in general do not explain the essence of social processes. At the level of everyday consciousness people are unable to grasp the causes of their social standing nor to see the ways of improving social life. At this level of social consciousness the mass of the people can easily be led astray by the exploiters and the reactionary elements. Such phenomena as fascism, religious fanaticism, national strife and all sorts of pogroms in which people *en masse* take part are only possible when their consciousness is not developed beyond everyday consciousness. In such a state of affairs people cannot realize who stands to gain from these actions. Feelings tell many of them that such actions are senseless but do not yet show them the possible ways to change their situation. All that explains once again why the exploiter classes are in their turn interested in conserving precisely such a level of social consciousness among the mass of the people, why they obstruct its development and instil the cult of ignorance and blind faith.

Meanwhile, everyday consciousness is a historical and class phenomenon. As the productive forces develop, class division becomes more marked, socio-economic conditions change, and people change and develop their consciousness, including class consciousness. In this sense every socio-economic formation has its own everyday consciousness and in every class society it is of class nature. That is why in any class society where irreconcilable, antagonistic contradictions exist between classes, consciousness of the working classes differs from that of the exploiters. For the same reason, despite the exploiters' attempts to shape people's consciousness in a fashion that suits themselves, it constantly wakens under the impact of objective conditions, develops and at certain stages reaches a level when the working people contrast their views, ideology and morality with the corresponding forms of consciousness of the exploiter classes and begin to oppose them. Transition to socialism changes the feelings, interests, ideals and goals in the life of the working people, as a result of which they reflect to a fuller extent social processes and become the conscious and active builders of a communist society.

The theoretical level of consciousness includes ideology and scientific knowledge. Ideology is a system of political, legal, ethical, religious, esthetic and philosophical views, ideas and theories worked out by the ideologists of classes and other social groups, as a reflection of their attitude to reality. Ideology includes philosophy (as the foundation of entire ideology), political doctrines, the goals and tasks of parties, ethics, esthetics, etc. Ideology as a whole is a theoretical expression of the vital interests of classes, their parties, states and nations. For this reason ideology serves as the consciousness of a class or a nation, gives them an explanation of social life and of their place in society in theoretical terms, points to the main goals and tasks that unite a class, state or nation and guides their activity to satisfy their vital interests.

Ideology comes into being and exists only in class society and is of a class and historical nature: every class has not only its own social psychology but its own ideology. As the vital, economic interests of classes, say, the class of the working people and the exploiter classes are different and even directly opposite, their ideologies are also fundamentally different.

Bourgeois ideology, for instance, as represented by its philosophy, political theories, and bourgeois parties, programmes, etc., serves the moribund, reactionary classes, expresses their interests and is reactionary by nature. Its reactionary character also stems from the fact that bourgeois ideology fails to reflect the demands of objective laws of social development, that is to say, it is not scientific. This also finds expression in the fact that bourgeois ideology attacks everything progressive, obscures the social consciousness of the people with all sorts of inventions, prevents them from becoming aware of their true interests and goals, and obstructs the progress of human society. Bourgeois ideology justifies the exploitation of man by man, breeds racial and national enmity and encourages wars of extermination.

It is opposed by Marxist-Leninist ideology, which basically consists of the philosophy of dialectical materialism, political economy, scientific communism, socio-political theories, ethics and esthetics.

Marxist-Leninist ideology reflects in theory the vital interests and communist ideals of the working class and the entire working people. It is also a science that correctly reflects the development of nature and society, shows the working people the aims and tasks of class struggle, helps create society without exploitation and serves as a theoretical foundation for building socialism and communism. As a scientific theory, Marxism-Leninism is not going to wither away with the disappearance of classes and, as a science of the more general laws of nature, society and thinking, and the laws of the operation of communist society, it is going to exist as long as there is humanity.

Unlike bourgeois ideology, which cloaks its party links with the sham slogans of non-affiliation, Marxist-Leninist ideology openly advocates adherence to party principles. Lenin said that "the non-party idea is a bourgeois idea. The party idea is a socialist idea".[1] This means that there can be no neutrality or compromise in the struggle of the two ideologies and two world outlooks.

The ideology of the working classes is state ideology in the socialist countries. But, being the only scientific ideology that is not to be replaced by any other (if the working classes have set out to build a better society, a society without exploitation), it is also proclaimed state ideology in the developing countries. Scientific ideology serves as a basis for building a new society in Afghanistan too. This means that the National Democratic Party of Afghanistan keeps in mind all the peculiarities characteristic of its country and is at the same time guided by the ideological principles of the working classes.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "The Socialist Party and Non-Party Revolutionism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, 1978, p. 79.

This is only natural. The ideology of the working class and the entire working people knows no national boundaries. It cannot be Russian, German, French or British, etc., because the working classes in all countries and nations have common vital interests, directed at putting an end to the exploitation of man by man. Class contradictions exist between the exploiter and exploited classes and not in relations between the working classes of one country and those of another, irrespective of what country it might be. Consequently, this ideology is internationalist by nature and is rightfully used by progressive governments and classes in the revolutionary transformation of society.

Speaking about the two levels of social consciousness (everyday and theoretical), it is worth stressing that these levels coexist and are closely interrelated. Though everyday consciousness usually develops spontaneously (while ideology is worked out by ideologists, who are the better trained and most devout representatives of a class), everyday consciousness, especially social psychology, affects ideology. Ideologists single out the vital interests of a class, substantiate them theoretically; they take into account changes in class positions and interests, which both develop ideology, and lead, for instance, to the working out of new political programmes and the state Constitution. Incidentally, this reaffirms the fact that the working classes in one country or another not merely transplant some ideology into their national environment or borrow it from other nations, but interpret and supplement it in keeping with a concrete situation and the goals and tasks facing the working classes of that particular country. This gives the lie to the assertions by bourgeois ideologists and the enemies of the working classes to the effect that the parties and governments advocating Marxism-Leninism as a scientific theory and applying its principles in the interests of the working people in their countries are "communist agents" because they "artificially" implant in their countries an "alien" ideology.

On the other side, ideology influences everyday consciousness (through agitation and propaganda), elevates the consciousness of a class to the theoretical level, and enables it to understand the interests of the public as a whole as well as its own vital interests and basic goals and tasks.

But it is only scientific ideology that fulfils this role. Bourgeois ideology serves only a handful of exploiters and does not explain them their goals and tasks, as they know only too well what they want, namely, profits. As far as its effect on the mass of the people is concerned, far from explaining these goals and tasks, it veils them, deluding people's consciousness with falsehoods and enabling the exploiters to deceive the people.

Bourgeois ideology acts like a poison for the working classes, being indeed alien to the social consciousness of the mass of the people. That is why progressive parties and governments call on every honest patriot in their country and on every working man not only not to be taken in by bourgeois ideology, but to resolutely oppose it.

As far as the ideology of the working classes is concerned, it is a truly noble and humane cause to assimilate and propagandize it, because it is noted for the lucidity of thought, profound knowledge, lofty morality, honesty, etc.

It is also important to see the relationship between social and individual consciousness. Though social consciousness is not a mere sum total of individual views of people, it does not exist outside of or independently from individual consciousness. Influenced by the conditions of daily life and material activity, the latter affects social consciousness and changes it through views and ideas that are conditioned by national, vocational and age differences.

Ideology, scientific theories, first take shape in the individual consciousness (of ideologists and scientists) and then come within the reach of society, entering social consciousness. On the other side, through upbringing, education, social intercourse and the mass media, social consciousness influences man's individual consciousness, enriching man with feelings, interests, ideals, and the theoretical understanding of society, the goals and tasks of the class he belongs to. In class society, individual consciousness is also affected by the social consciousness of different classes and groups, as a result of which the individual consciousness may include elements of the social consciousness of other social groups to which that person does not belong.

Another important feature of *social consciousness* is that in its development it is *relatively self-dependent*, relatively independent from social being. The latter only eventually determines social consciousness; while it develops and reflects social being, however, there may be all sorts of incongruences and discrepancies in the way society reflects it, leading to certain aberrations in consciousness.

These incongruences and discrepancies are enhanced by the fact that social consciousness is shaped not only under the impact of social being but also under the influence of ideological attitudes and institutions which in antagonistic societies, as it has already been mentioned, veil economic relations or, to put it bluntly, distort facts. All this results in social consciousness somewhat lagging behind social being in its development. This lag is also explained by the fact that social consciousness has a certain continuity and retains elements of the social consciousness of the past historical epoch (scientific knowledge and survivals of the past in people's minds). All this stands in the way of harmonizing social consciousness with developing social being and creates certain difficulties in establishing new social relations.

At the same time part of social consciousness, above all ideology and scientific theories developed in one country or another can under certain circumstances outstrip social being. This happened with Marxism, which emerged long before the corresponding social being developed in the capitalist countries. This characteristic of social consciousness is also manifest in the fact that the ideology of the working classes becomes part of social consciousness in countries, where the economic prerequisites, social being, is not as yet socialist. In such cases social consciousness, far from "hindering" the development of social being, on the contrary, promotes its progress.

The foregoing attests to the great role played by social consciousness in the life of society. If it is advanced and approximates to scientific consciousness, it ensures social progress. With this circumstance in mind, bourgeois ideologists absolutize and exaggerate the role of social consciousness, trying to represent it as the decisive factor of social development. Bourgeois sociological theories argue that society can be improved by "bringing order" into people's thoughts and perfecting their social consciousness rather than by transforming social being. The rich and the poor will supposedly disappear as soon as all people understand that inequality is immoral. This is a reiteration of an old idealist thesis that "ideas rule the world" and an idealistic revision of the basic law of social development which says that it is social consciousness which determines social being and not the other way round.

Dialectical materialism admits that social consciousness has an important role to play in social life; being dependent on social being, it at the same time is active with respect to social being and affects it. Advanced, scientific social consciousness speeds up the development of social being. Conversely, outdated, unscientific and reactionary social consciousness restrains the development of social being and the improvement of people's material activity and material relations in society.

Hence the difficult and responsible tasks each revolutionary society faces in transforming and developing the social and individual consciousness of the people. These tasks come to the fore in the conditions of the revolutionary change that is taking place in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. Much has already been done in transforming social being there. But the rates of this transformation, just as the development of the revolution itself, are considerably slowed down by the backwardness of the everyday consciousness of a certain section of society, by delusions current in some groups of people and by lies implanted in the inexperienced people's consciousness by the counter-revolutionary elements. This means that extensive educational, agitation and propaganda activities among the mass of the people are called for to bridge the gap between social consciousness and the economic transformations carried out in the country.

Science-based ideology is to play an especially big part in this processs. It guides the people's activity and serves as the foundation in setting forth the basic goals and tasks of the working classes' struggle to satisfy their vital interests—the elimination of exploitation and the building of a new, just society.

In such cases the ideological defence of the revolutionary achievements is no less important than armed defence.

Ideological defence presupposes a wide range of measures to disseminate scientific ideology, to shape scientific world outlook to promote progressive social consciousness and to instil class self-awareness and irreconcilable class attitude towards the exploiters. Ideological defence of the revolutionary gains also presupposes extensive educational work and the development of patriotic sentiment and internationalism among the mass of the people. To defend the revolution ideologically means to engage in diverse party and political activities and to stimulate the work of youth organizations in studying and summing up the popular mood, the people's demands and needs in order to be able to reflect correctly their aspirations. A resolute and all-out struggle against bourgeois and revisionist ideology and against the intrigues of the counter-revolutionary forces at home and abroad is also necessary.

Ideological defence is a success when the entire educational effort is made not in isolation from real deeds but in conformity with specific conditions and when the party functionaries and state officials abide in their actions by the revolutionary law and always show justice and honesty. Every word uttered, every line printed and every appeal for action should be supported by practice, by the deeds both of individual leaders and the entire guiding and organizing section of society. Ideological work is not a one-time campaign but a painstaking, unceasing and creative process of advance, involving the national educational system, political enlightenment, the activities of all cultural institutions and the mass media, agitation and propaganda, the training of ideological caders, etc.

## 2. Religious Consciousness and Religious Attitudes

Religion is a form of social consciousness. Religious consciousness includes the social feelings, ideals, interests and views of people who recognize the existence of the other, supernatural world. Like other forms of social consciousness, religious consciousness has two levels: everyday religious consciousness or religion, and religious ideology or theology.

Everyday religious consciousness is characterized by belief in the existence of the other world, heaven and hell, in addition to nature, and of supernatural beings—God, angels and spirits, as well as by fatalism, ideas as to the creation of the world, religious ideals, knowledge of the norms of religious morality and worship, and religious interests.

Theology is the sum total of religious doctrines developed by the clergy to prove and substantiate the existence of gods and the supernatural.

How and when did these feelings and this faith appear? What caused the appearance of religion? What role does religion play in social life?

Religious rituals and mysticism, the psychology of the believers cannot in themselves explain the essence of religious consciousness and religious attitudes nor give answers to these questions.

Meanwhile theologians inquire into religious problems and profess religious principles. It is expedient therefore to consider the way the theologians themselves define religion and religious attitudes. Most Christian theologians derive the term religion from Latin *religio* meaning "reverence of gods" and *religare* meaning "to bind". According to the theological point of view, religion is a bond between man and God. Religion is represented as a system of laws, beliefs, cult and ritual actions, and norms of behaviour allegedly ruled by God and constantly binding man to Him.

Non-Christian religions profess similar views. For instance, Buddhists believe that the essence of religion boils down to the doctrine of the attainment of salvation by Gautama Buddha, the founder of Buddhism, and to the rules of conduct laid down by Buddha, abidance by which ensures believers salvation and subsequent reunion with Buddha.

To Muslims, followers of Allah, religion is embodied in the rules and principles of behaviour written down in the sacred book of the Muslims, the Koran, which vouchsafe them communion with Allah and salvation.

To sump up, the main message of theology is that religion is a bond between man and God.

Many find this declaration satisfactory. At the same time other people pondering over religious problems point to one flaw in this definition. For this definition to be recognized as true, it is necessary to prove that God exists, but there are no means of proving it. To demonstrate their point, those who doubt his existence name numerous Gods which used to be worshipped but which, it later turned out, did not exist. Gods like Bel, Anu, Ishtar, Osiris, Isis, Horus, Set, Zeus, Poseidon, Hades, Apollo, Athena, Hera, Artemis, Jupiter, Mars, Janus, Vesta—the list is endless—are now no longer worshipped.

Unable to refute these arguments, theologians try to punish those who doubt. When the ancient Greek philosophers Anaxagoras and Socrates dared question the existence of the Olympic gods, they were made to pay dearly for it—both were sentenced to death. Anaxagoras escaped punishment but Socrates was forced to drink hemlock. Similar examples were numerous in the subsequent history of human society. But it still failed to lend force to the theological concept of religion. Hence the different theories both as to the emergence and essence of religion that have appeared and continue to crop up in the world.

Dialectical materialism was the first to resolve scientifically the problem of the emergence of religion and religious attitudes. According to this philosophy, religion is a complicated social phenomenon. Engels stressed that religion cannot be explained by merely declaring it is nonsense concocted by liars.[1] Similar to other forms of social consciousness, religion depends on the level of development of material production and on the nature of production relations.

Religion appeared when the productive forces were underdeveloped and man fully depended on the elements. It was the primitive people's impotence in dealing with nature and fear of the fierce and mysterious forces of nature that bred distorted ideas about these forces in people's minds. That was why people began calling every unknown force a god and pronounced every object that affected their existence as sacred. Thus early forms of religion deified not only the stern elements but also plants and even animals. Zeus, a god of ancient Greeks who had human characteristics, could also turn into a bull, an eagle, a swan, and some types of plants. In India the cow is considered to be a sacred animal to this day.

As the productive forces and social relations developed, people passed over from deifying and venerating natural phenomena to deifying social forces; the functions of gods also underwent change. Mars was initially a god of fire, later became a god of metalworking. The history of religion shows that every people had their own god, depending on the conditions of their existence. The gods of the victors took the place of the gods of the defeated and with time assumed some of the features of gods of the defeated people. The unification of tribes and nationalities resulted in the unification and even merger of gods. When large monarchies were formed, cults characteristic of tribal unions and early states (in which a supreme deity was usually singled out of several gods) gave way to the cult of a single omnipotent god endowed with all the attributes of the other gods. Engels pointed out that there could be no single god without a single king. The oneness of the god controlling the numerous natural phenomena is the reflection of one Oriental despot, which seemingly or in reality united people with hostile and clashing interests.[2]

---

[1] See: Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 19, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1962, s. 297-98.

[2] See: "Engels an Marx in Brüssel, 18. Oktober 1846", in: Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 27, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1973, S. 57.

The social relations that took shape under the impact of the developing productive forces acquired special sway over the people, when labour division deepened and private property and classes appeared.

In exploiter class society the illiterate working classes, who were denied all rights, proved just as helpless in the face of the blind forces of social relations as their ancestors in the face of the blind forces of nature. Man facing these forces acts as an abject creature and a servant of God, hoping that God will have mercy on him. This oppression and the seemingly utter helplessness of the working people in front of the exploiters make them believe in supernatural beings that are to save them. This fantastic reflection of reality continues and will continue as long as the products of man's labour dominate the producers of material wealth and until conditions are created for man to become aware of the reasons for his plight and of the laws of and paths towards his emancipation.

In exploiter societies man's consciousness overcomes its dependence on the power of the supernatural extremely slowly. The exploiters are not interested in seeing man free his feelings from the power of God, whose concept is used by them to keep the mass of the people in constant obedience and submission. With this aim in view they finance and support all sorts of religious institutions, set up theology chairs and departments at educational establisments, carry out large-scale compulsory propaganda, educational and "enlightening" work to instil religious sentiments in primary and secondary schools, whip up religious strife and unleash fratricidal wars under the banner of religion. Suffice it to recall in this connection the notorious crusades of the Middle Ages. Under the slogan of recovering the Holy Land from the Muslims, thousands-strong armies of crusaders massacred Muslims. Let us recall the notorious massacre of St. Bartholomew (1572) when 30,000 Huguenots were killed in Paris alone because of religious fervour. At present the Israeli Zionists set Christendom against the Muslims and exterminate the Muslim people of Palestine virtually in front of the entire world. Exploiter production relations and the deliberate use of religion by the exploiters in their class interests account for the fact that even in our age of science and technology religious beliefs are still widespread in these societies. The exploiters find it suitable to cloak class distinctions and the class antagonism with the "unity" of faith, though, as a matter of fact, they themselves are hardly guided by religious principles. Could a true Muslim deceive another and make profit at the expense of another Muslim? The answer must be in the negative. But then the exploiters do that. Can any true Muslim sell or buy another Muslim, as if he were cattle? Of course, not, but then some feudal lords and merchants have the right to take girls under age from poor families in payment for debt and sell them to other rich people. Can a true

Muslim slander the innocent or kill him? Of course, not, though this is precisely what the counter-revolutionaries, the former feudal lords, do by spreading lies about the representatives of the people's government and by killing innocent teachers and students, old people and children only because they enjoy the right to free life granted to them by the revolutionary government! Such examples can be cited *ad infinitum*. But the believers are blind to all this and refuse to even think about it. The exploiters place them into such conditions of existence and grant such social "rights" to them that their consciousness is unable to develop and rise to a level at which they could understand what is going on! They cannot see a way out of their situation nor can they try and protest against such injustice. Those who see the apostasy of the exploiters and their violation of the commonly recognized norms of morality and Shari'a dare not come out against their masters because they completely depend on them and are powerless in front of them. The exploiters are assisted by theologians who call for obedience and submission and promise that the oppressors of the people will be punished "in the other world".

Scientific analysis shows that this situation cannot last forever: religious consciousness also develops. History demonstrates that not only social relations but religions, too, change under the impact of major social upheavals. For instance, the ancient religions were vanquished by Christianity during the decline of slave-owning society. Christianity inherited certain features of the old religions through, for instance, recognition of the Old Testament, Judaism and the Oriental myths of suffering, dying and resurrecting gods, and blended all that with vulgarized Greek, particularly Stoic philosophy. As feudalism developed, Christianity also changed, turning into a religion appropriate for feudalism. Thus, founded in the Roman Empire as a religion of the unfortunate and oppressed mass of the people, Christianity turned later into the official ideology of the ruling classes, losing at the same time some of its essential characteristics, namely, its democratic spirit, its negative attitude to rituals and so on.

With the emergence of capitalism the feudal Christian Catholic Church also changed some of its characteristics. There appeared Protestantism with its idea of man's direct communion with God, its appeal to individuals and preaching such virtues as thrift, perseverance and so on. The development of capitalism resulted in Catholicism, though preserving its dogmas, having to adjust itself to new conditions and to develop its own social doctrine of reconciling labor and capital and of justifying colonialism and wars. Today, too, Christianity continues to change.

This is because it has to adjust itself to new conditions that emerged as a result of the development of science and technology and the far-reaching revolutionary process in the life of society. In the Middle Ages the Church used to put scientists to death and punish the flock for their interest in knowledge. Today they pose as champions of science claiming that religion "complements" science inasmuch as, without religion, science is unable to get at the truth. They try to bridge the gap that is seen to exist between knowledge and progress, on the one hand, and blind faith and regression, on the other.

Economic and social causes were also responsible for the emergence and evolution of Islam, one of the three major religions of the world. It was founded in Western Arabia in the early 7th century, when the Arab peoples passed over from the primitive-communal system to class society and united into a feudal theocratic state of the Arab caliphate. Islamic dogmas formed out of elements and under the influence of primitive religions as well as Judaism, Christianity, Manichaeism and Zoroastrianism. The fact that Islam came into being precisely when a class Arab state was taking shape, was formed of primitive religions and bore the impact of both Oriental and Western religious movements shows that its appearance was dictated by the social needs for unifying and subordinating some classes to others and some peoples to others. Islam emerged as an ideological reflection of these processes. The higher level of the development of the productive forces attained by the time of the emergence of Islam and the further development of theological theories account for the fact that, compared with other religions, Islam has fewer contradictions, repetitions and variant readings.

At the same time, like other religions, Islam also develops. Islamic interpretation of dogmas and cult and the explanation of different social phenomena and scientific and cultural achievements change in keeping with the changing social conditions. In the early period Islam, as the ideological superstructure, supported the basis of early feudal society with vestiges of slave-owning relations, justifying and sanctifying feudal exploitation. Today it continues serving feudal and bourgeois societies and even tries to adjust itself to the conditions of socialism.

Like other religions, Islam finds it ever more difficult to do this, as human society develops. Religion is essentially manifest as a force of tradition, resistance and conservatism rather than a force of social rejuvenation and creativity. It has no future: the social reasons for the existence of religion disappear already under socialism. Man becomes a free member of society and a master of his own destiny. Neither his present life nor his future destiny are determined by mysterious forces and fear of the supernatural. Man is sure of his morrow. His entire material and spiritual activity is closely connected with enlightenment and science; as a result there is less and less room for religious beliefs in man's life. Under socialism there are no classes interested in the forced dissemination of faith and in using it to further their own class interests.

Universal primary and later incomplete secondary education, to say nothing of the ramified network of higher educational establishments, has also prevented people from taking things at their face value without any scientific substantiation. These and similar reasons account for the fact that under socialism, religion is less wide spread than in the exploiter societies, and that it loses its influence over the life of the people.

Therefore bourgeois ideologists and reactionary clergymen calumniate socialism, trying to accuse it of allegedly oppressing and persecuting the believers and also of violating man's spiritual life. These lies have to be refuted again and again.

The appearance and existence of religion is determined by objective socio-economic reasons. The weakening of its influence also takes place under the influence of objective factors. Hence the unequivocal conclusion of dialectical materialism that objective causes gave birth to religion and will bring about its demise. It is impossible to ban religion at will. It is equally impossible to recognize the right of some people to forcibly convert others to their creed and to make anybody, especially children, submit to any faith. Under socialism it is completely out of the question. Freedom of conscience, that is, the right to profess or not to profess any religion, is guaranteed by law under socialism inasmuch as it is the private business of any citizen who is of age. The church is separated from the state and cannot interfere in the affairs of the state, just as the state does not interfere in the affairs of the church nor in the private lives of the believers.

To ensure that freedom of conscience is guaranteed and to regulate relations between religious organizations in the Soviet Union, a special Council for Religious Affairs was set up under the USSR Council of Ministers. It has been entrusted with exercising control over the observance, correct application and execution of all legal acts pertaining to religion and guaranteeing freedom of conscience in the USSR. The Council functions in close cooperation with the republican, territory and regional Soviets of Working People's Deputies. All this ensures complete freedom and guarantees that citizens professing any religion have the right to fulfil their religious aspirations and that religious organizations are free to function.

The principles of organization and the work of religious Muslim establishments in the USSR can serve as an example.

In the Soviet Union Islam is primarily represented in the republics of Central Asia, Kazakhstan, Transcaucasia, the autonomous republics of the Northern Caucasus and in the Volga Region, in some regions of the Russian Federation, in Byelorussia, Lithuania and some other areas. With the exception of the majority of the Azerbaijani believers who profess Shiism, an insignificant number of Persians and Kurds living in Turkmenia and the Bukhara Region of Uzbekistan, all the

Muslims in this country adhere to Sunnism. There are some Ismaili living in the Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Region. Groups of Sufis, advocates of a mystic ascetic doctrine within Islam (Muridism), function in the Checheno-Ingush Autonomous Republic and in some regions of Daghestan and Kazakhstan. Four religious boards independent of each other run the affairs of Muslim communities in different regions of the country: the Muslim Board of Central Asia and Kazakhstan with its residence in Tashkent, the Muslim Board of the European USSR and Siberia with its residence in Ufa, the Muslim Board of the Northern Caucasus with its residence in Buinaksk, and the Muslim Board of Transcaucasia located in Baku. Every religious board has its representatives in the administrative districts (regions or republics) in the rank of kazi (kadi), who are appointed by the Presidiums of the Boards and ensure direct contacts with Muslim communities. Religious boards and their representatives exercise influence upon services in mosques and to a certain extent control the content of the religious propaganda carried out and see to it that all the rights of the believers are observed. The religious boards pass instructions on the key issues of modern religious life that are brought to the notice of the believers in mosques. The believers elect from among themselves the muta-walliat, the body running the everyday affairs of the communities connected with the upkeep of religious objects and prayer houses and with spending material resources. There is the Mir-arab madrasah (Muslim religious school) in Bukhara training Muslim clergy. A group also exists there to train Shia clergymen. A higher religious school also functions in Tashkent.

Approximately the same principle and similar democratic rights are observed in the operation of the religious organizations and communities of other religious denominations in different areas of the Soviet Union. These are the facts of the situation as regards religious believers in the USSR.

At the same time dialectical materialism openly states that it and the revolutionary parties guided by it do not attempt to harmonize religious ideology with the world outlook of the working classes and are against the meretricious flirtation with religious ideology resorted to by the bourgeois parties in order to subordinate the world outlook of the mass of the people to bourgeois ideology. Bourgeois ideologists pose as "friends" of religion because it leads the believers to renounce efforts to see their needs satisfied on Earth, reconciles them with social evil, nurtures obedience and submission to the ruling classes and preaches passive resistance and inertia in attaining earthly goals.

Materialists do not pin their hopes for the future on deceit nor provide for their well-being at the expense of the deluded people but are, on the contrary, sincere friends of all the oppressed, including the believers, and want to improve life both for the latter and themselves by transforming material and social conditions. It is the revolutionaries rather than bourgeois ideologists and reactionaries who work to make triumphant the cause of all the oppressed, including the believers, and who are the friends of the latter.

To sum up, material production and people's material activity condition not only all types of social relations but also social consciousness. The development of material production entails the development of social relations and social consciousness, as a result of which old, outdated relations, political and philosophical views, moral rules, etc., are discarded and replaced by new ones which reflect in a fuller and more correct way the changed conditions of material life. Religion is a form of social consciousness; consequently, together with the development of production and social being, religion, too, develops in a bid to adjust itself to the new conditions of life. However, as it appears only when the level of the development of the productive forces is not high enough and persists only in the realm of antiquated, exploiter production relations, it loses its influence on the mass of the people when society moves to a higher level of development, to socialism, and its need in religion lessens. Under communism religion disappears altogether.

This happens not because somebody bans religious sentiments at will but because the level of people's consciousness steadily grows and they begin to prefer scientific knowledge to faith.

### *Test Questions*

1. What is social consciousness and how does it relate to social being?
2. What forms of social consciousness do you know?
3. What is the structure of social consciousness?
4. What is religion and what are the causes for its emergence and continuation?
5. What is the future of religion?

## *Chapter XIV*

# THE REACTIONARY NATURE OF MODERN BOURGEOIS PHILOSOPHY

The preceding chapters outlined the basic tenets of dialectical materialism and its approach to nature, man and his society, their development and cognizability. We have seen that all its principles are formulated on the basis of scientific analysis of real facts and processes and reflect the laws of the objective world in our consciousness. As scientific knowledge advances, dialectical materialism develops, too, and probes deeper into the essence of reality. From the early naïve materialists of the Antiquity and through numerous achievements by materialist philosophers in various countries in our time, materialist philosophy found its consummate expression in dialectical materialism, owing in particular to the discoveries made by Marx, Engels and Lenin. Its principles, laws and categories epitomize the summits of philosophical knowledge accumulated by the human civilization and represent in the fullest, most precise and profound way what has been uncovered by modern science in the world of objective reality.

This philosophy is credited with increasingly imbuing social practice with the principles of genuine humanism and confidence in the triumph of reason and justice over the forces of reaction. All this shows that materialism rose to unprecedented heights in its development.

Idealism, too, developed throughout this period and at every stage its concepts and conclusions were directly opposite to those expounded by materialists. On many occasions science shattered idealist dogmas only to have idealists reiterate them again and again in a slightly modified wording, to suit the circumstances. It is obviously not a matter of delusions or some "special" arguments idealists purportedly possess but of their *consciously* distorting facts. Idealists have always served the exploiters: they have offered not a single idea that would be in the interests of the working classes. Similarly, they have tried to dispute every idea serving the interests of the working classes and facilitating their emancipation from exploitation. We have seen this in part when we discussed certain problems of matter, consciousness, development and cognition. This is even more manifest in their modern philosophic concepts, which forward the cause of the bourgeoisie and are for this reason called bourgeois philosophy. Let us have a closer look at the main trends of this philosophy.

## 1. Modern Bourgeois Philosophy: The Main Trends and Their Untenability

Against the background of the acute ideological confrontation between socialism and capitalism modern bourgeois philosophy like a Harlequin decks itself out in various and most fashionable styles which at present include neopositivism, neorealism, critical realism, pragmatism, operationalism, phenomenalism, existentialism, neo-Thomism and personalism. The vast number of philosophical schools and trends, philosophers and propagandists in the capitalist countries bespeaks the extreme crisis of modern bourgeois philosophy rather than its flourishing, as its apologists claim. Like any concrete objective truth, genuine science is always alone. There can be only one mathematics, one physics and one scientific sociology. In his time Diderot aptly pointed out that truth was one, while lies were many. Despite considerable outward differences, all these schools have essentially common characteristics.

### The Main Features of Modern Bourgeois Philosophy

These common characteristics are mainly as follows:

1. All trends in bourgeois philosophy are, as a rule, idealist. No matter which philosophical school we take or whatever its name, each looks upon ideas, will, sensations, intuition, "providence" and so on as being primary rather than the objective world or nature. Aware of the unpopularity of idealism, all of them usually try to pose as unaffiliated to any party, claiming "neutrality". However, their advocacy of voluntarism and emphasis on force, acts of will and unrestrained energy, which allegedly enable them to attain the necessary goals despite the requirements of laws, expose them as subjective idealists. Subjective idealism fosters bourgeois amoralism, individualism and egoism and has a great bearing on the arts in the capitalist world.

2. Each of the modern bourgeois schools has a pronounced class nature, which is manifest through the fact that ultimately all of them uphold capitalism, on the one hand, and oppose communism, on the other. Modern bourgeois political and economic theories, philosophy

and sociology, ethics and aesthetics are keynoted by their ideological justification of the sway of monopolies and exploitation, their defamation of public ownership and collectivism, their eulogy of militarism and war, their justification of colonialism and racism and their incitement of the peoples to enmity and hatred. Special importance is attached in the system of bourgeois philosophical schools to proving that Marxism-Leninism, scientific communism are "evil", "groundless" and "unscientific" and to slandering real socialism. Posing as friends of socialism, they propose "models" of supposedly "improved", "modern" or "democratic" socialism, which invariably suits the exploiting classes.

3. Furthermore, the basic theoretical concepts of all the bourgeois philosophical schools undergo a crisis and degradation, as a reflection of the crisis and degradation of the capitalist system. Bourgeois philosophy is no longer capable of developing any progressive system and for the most part brings back to life or revamps the ideas of such philosophers of the past as Plato, Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), Bishop Berkeley, theologian Sören Kierkegaard (1813-1855) and others. In this process the progressive elements of some philosophical systems of the past (like, for example, Kant's "thing in itself", elements of Leibnitz's dialectics, and so on) are cast aside and only the most obscure and reactionary aspects are adopted. Among other things, this characteristic of modern bourgeois philosophy attests to the spiritual impoverishment of the bourgeoisie, which reflects its position as a moribund class. Sensing this, its pundits seek to find a way out of the situation by adjusting to the new conditions and inventing ever new and subtler sophisms. One should not therefore underestimate the chances of bourgeois philosophy influencing the mass of the people, especially those with little experience in all the intricacies of this opiate, which is all the more pernicious since it specializes primarily in epistemological problems and nurtures agnosticism, irrationalism and intuitivism.

There is nothing strange in the bourgeois philosophers' heightened interest in problems of cognition: speculating on difficulties encountered by scholars in unraveling some problems, they try to undermine the working classes' belief in the possibility of cognizing the objective laws of history and of the revolutionary transformation of society. It was Nietzsche (1844-1900) who wrote that when workers are endowed with logic they start riots.

As Marxist ideas gain in influence and patent idealism becomes ever more unpopular, efforts are made to disguise idealism as a twisted interpretation of the cognitive process. Denying the cognizability of the world and its laws as a whole, idealists do not dispute the significant role science plays in society's practical life, trying in this way to conceal their glaring anachronism in such an important field of human activity as science. That is why agnosticism is developed by bourgeois philosophers along the lines of irrationalism and intuitivism, which belittle man's mind, contrasting it with unreasoning will, instinct and intuition. Man is pronounced to be driven by instincts, whereas the world itself is pictured as a scene for the operation of blind, mystical and unfathomable forces. Modern irrationalist philosophy is exemplified by existentialism, phenomenalism and neo-Freudianism, accompanied by neopositivism and neo-Thomism that preach agnosticism.

In general the whole of modern bourgeois philosophy inculcates an unscientific world outlook among the mass of the people and preaches pessimism and the senseless and helpless existence of man.

Let us analyze some of these trends.

## Main Trends of Bourgeois Philosophy

*Neopositivism* is most widespread among bourgeois philosophers in our day and constitutes the third stage of positivist philosophy developed by the French philosopher, Auguste Comte (1798-1857) and the British philosopher Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) in the mid-nineteenth century. The positivists advocated "positive" knowledge, that is to say, science free from any philosophy. "Science is philosophy for itself,"[1] they asserted. It may seem on the face of it that there is nothing wrong with this trend. All the more so since some of its proponents–representatives of *logical positivism* (Carnap, Reichenbach and others)–did a great deal in developing logic, while some exponents of *logical syntax* (Carnap and others) demonstrated the use of syntactical studies of languages, which formalize certain aspects of natural sciences. Besides, unlike positivism, neopositivism does not reject philosophy in general but only insists on strengthening its logical aspects. This apparently accounts for the fact that the positivists succeed in winning over to their side a certain section of the scientific community. The true meaning of neopositivism lies in something else, however. Like all the preceding positivists, neopositivists interpret experience and facts in an idealist and mataphysical way. They exaggerate the role of mathematical methods in the cognitive process, absolutize symbols and ignore their objective content. According to them, "facts" and "experience" do not exist without the subject and are eventually equivalent to psychological facts, facts of consciousness.

Bertrand Russell (1872-1970), a leading representative of the trend, asserted, among other things, that the subject uses logic to create at will the logical structure of the world in keeping with, and on the basis of, his sensations. Hence the conclusion that logical analysis would destroy philosophy as a system of views on the world. For positivists knowledge is the process of logically structuring and arranging sensations and signs and not the reflection of reality. Similar to Kant, they attach special importance to *a priori* knowledge reflecting something general that is not present in sensations or reality. Scientific knowledge and science turn out to be not the reflection of objective reality but the product of an agreement between scientists. The need to check knowledge against objective reality is ignored. Those of the neopositivists who study words and word collocations (semanticists) absolutize the role of language, believing that it lies at the heart of all things. Like their idealist predecessors, they assert that the world is the projection of words, the word derivative. Things allegedly do not exist in themselves but only after being designated by the subject with the help of certain terms. Not only the natural world depends on words but also the history of society. That is why all problems of social development and spiritual life, together with scientific problems, belong to the domain of logic and languaage. Semantic positivists argue that all class contradictions and discord in international life occur because of the wrong usage of words. Disagreement and contradictions between classes can allegedly be eliminated if all people master positivist methods. One of the proponents of this trend wrote that the replacement of only one word, viz. "capitalism", can change the course of history. The author suggests that it should be called "economic democracy", "productivism", etc. This concept quite conforms with their theory because, according to it, concepts and statements embodied in words are merely signs and symbols of the objective world. This is where they manifest again their kinship with ordinary idealism which is as old as the world, while the entire arsenal of dubious arguments used by the positivists to substantiate what they call "neutral" philosophy is nothing else but the painting over of old idealist dogmas to look as science.

---

[1] Cited from: *Modern Bourgeois Philosophy*, by a group of authors, Moscow University Publishers, 1972, p. 71 (in Russian).

Neopositivists resort to this speculation on philosophy and to replacing it with logistic in a bid to refute materialism with its own weapon—its striving for knowledge, the summing up of scientific data and analysis of experience—and to operate with different means that would at least to some extent not stand in defiance of common sense. For the same reason they are at one with the idealists of the past as they deny the importance of world outlook, of the fundamental question of philosophy in cognizing the world and of the dialectical-materialist method in cognizing and transforming the world.

We have already seen, however, that truly scientific philosophy cannot be reduced to some special science, including logic or grammar: it is a science of the more general law of nature, society and thinking.

On the other hand, an objective analysis of philosophical knowledge shows that as it develops theoretical thinking inevitably leads to materialism and dialectics. By applying the methods of logical, syntactical and semantic analysis to idealist philosophy, which is notorious for its relativism, agnosticism and rejection of the objective world and objective truth, neopositivists have merely laid bare its shortcomings and showed anew the absurd conclusions of idealism, its dispensability and inapplicability in human practice.

## Existentialism

Another widespread trend of modern bourgeois philosophy is *existentialism* (existence philosophy), which appeared in the 1920s and is especially popular in France and West Germany. It was founded by the German idealists, Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) and Karl Jaspers (1883-1969), who brought back to life and readjusted to modern conditions the views of the Danish mystic, Kierkegaard. Other notable representatives of existentialism are Jean-Paul Sartre, Gabriel Marcel and Albert Camus.

Existentialists answer the fundamental question of philosophy in terms of subjective idealism. In their view the world is a spiritual "flow" of the psychological feelings of the subject, man's existence. At the heart of this existence lies man's fear of the finiteness of his existence and of his helplessness, the fear of death. Man deals only with his own feelings and his own personal world. Jaspers, for instance, believed that the aim of cognition is to cognize one's own, individual, spiritual life, one's own inner self rather than the laws of the objective world. For this reason existentialists focus their research on the existence of individuals. Man is lonely, wretched and helpless. He is nobody's concern, consumed with fear and despair and seeing no hope. Attempts to master the world are futile, therefore man should withdraw into his inner world, even though there is nothing but emptiness there too. There is only one way in which man can realize his own self to the full extent. He is the master of his life and can terminate it. Suicide is the decisive proof of man's freedom. Camus declared that "there is but one truly serious philosophical problem, and that is suicide."[1] Materialists have always deemed it the task of their philosophy to free man from fear that cripples life, while existentialists, on the contrary, cultivate the fear of death. What they preach is self-abnegation and not making sacrifice for the sake of some ideal. To existentialists sacrifice is an *end in itself*: man's freedom is the freedom to choose between miserable existence and death, and there is no other way to freedom and salva-

[1] Albert Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus and Other Essays*, Knopf, NY, 1959, p. 3.

tion than through death.

The existentialists criticize materialist philosophy for having allegedly neglected the problem of personality for the sake of socio-economic problems, as if the latter had nothing to do with the problem of man. The main aim of the existentialists is precisely to prove that human existence does not depend on social relations and that the problem of man cannot be resolved by any revolutionary transformations. People should therefore draw the conclusion that there is no need to interfere with the life of society or try and change it, that is, to do away with the capitalists and other exploiters. Existentialism is obviously reactionary in essence, but it has an impressive following due to the conditions of life in exploiter societies. There man is indeed left to his own resources and hardly anybody cares. One has to be tough to be successful there and to be able to withstand the inhumanities of life in that society. Most of the ordinary working people have to drag out a miserable existence, working for the exploiters. In that society they frequently find themselves in a situation that may lead to suicide. That is why this philosophy is cultivated among them.

Some representatives of the bourgeoisie also have existentialist views because, fearful of losing their riches in the conditions of the general crisis of capitalism, they try to find consolation in dissecting their emotional experiences. It is not for them that existentialism is intended, however. By preaching fear, despair and individualism, it seeks to debase the social nature of man and his links with the rest of the people, to weaken the working people's will to fight for their emancipation from the yoke of the exploiters and to undermine the people's confidence of their victory. It relieves the exploiters of the responsibility for people's destinies and places it entirely on the individuals themselves.

Existentialists hold extremely reactionary views of the problems of war, claiming that the causes of wars lie in the nature of man himself. For this reason the threat of war always hangs over the people and cannot be avoided. In his book, *Die Atombombe und die Zukunft des Menschen*, Jaspers wrote that there is no other alternative to the building up of armaments and to turning the world into a desert of radioactive dust.

This confirms that existentialism is a product of the development and disintegration of exploiter society, whose interests have always been catered for and defended by idealism.

There are many other trends in modern bourgeois philosophy but, no matter which one we take, all of them are of the classical idealist lineage and eventually serve to justify the legitimacy of exploiter society and to safeguard the interests of the exploiter classes. They skilfully mask their reactionary essence, pander to philistine tastes and deceive the working people.

## 2. Bourgeois Philosophy and the Ideological Struggle over the Social and Cultural Heritage of the Newly-Free Countries

Bourgeois philosophers have always sought to expand the "zones" of their influence, actively imposing their world outlook upon the mass of the people and calumniating progressive theories and humane social systems. They have launched an especially bitter ideological struggle against the socialist countries. Hundreds of bourgeois radio stations transmit heaps of slanderous material. Old blatant lies and subtle falsehoods are put out in monographs, articles and reports, circulated in millions of copies.

All these undertakings of bourgeois ideologists aim at preventing the working people of the socialist countries from successfully building a new society, at confusing unstable elements, attracting them to their side and using them as their voluntary or involuntary propagandists. All attempts of this kind prove to be futile, however. The socialist nations have long grasped the true meaning of bourgeois propaganda and, guided by scientific ideology, are successfully building the most progressive society yet known to man.

The national liberation and democratic revolutions in the Asian, African and Latin American countries are another cause of worry to bourgeois ideologists. Under these circumstances they have to employ the most diverse ways and means to influence the newly-free countries. They pass censure on these countries' ideology, contrasting it with that of their own, slander scientific philosophy and encourage leftist and extremist vagaries by certain philosophers from young developing states so as to make people distrust the transformations going on there, and so on.

Bourgeois philosophers do not risk addressing their idealist dogmas directly to the social consciousness of the newly-free nations. To score some success in the regions of the national liberation movement, they carefully study the ideological trends in the developing countries, trying to see their logic and their motive forces, and analyze the social basis, the foundations of social life, which condition the socio-class structure and the nature of these countries' development. In the majority of these countries the nature of basic economic patterns and hence the division of society into groups and classes are not very marked. Family and tribal ties, caste prejudice, religious preferences, etc., all often veil class relations, which is precisely what bourgeois philosophers intend to exploit. They find it most convenient and important under the circumstances to establish close contacts and ideological affinity with the proponents of the more conservative and reactionary ideas in the Asian and African countries. In a bid to ingratiate themselves with the conservative strata of newly-free society and also those who are still under the sway of the old mode of life and antiquated mentality, bourgeois philosophers develop and encourage ideas about the "exclusiveness" of Oriental culture and the need to "preserve" it the way it used to be when it enabled the bourgeois ideologists to deceive the oppressed peoples and to keep them at one and the same level of development.

Aware of the aspirations of many people towards socialism, they jeer that allegedly only an "unmodernized" man can pass over to socialism. For instance, Herbert Marcuse, an American philosopher and sociologist of German descent, affirms that it is an "Oriental man" unspoilt by Western culture who is the new man to pass over to socialism. He and his ilk ardently support the more conservative ideologists from the developing countries.

Asian and African peoples have made a great contribution to world culture, and to understand this is of paramount importance for the development of national consciousness. But it is impossible to rest on one's laurels. This consciousness should be further developed by constantly moving ahead and assimilating everything of the new and the progressive. Indeed it is quite evident that to praise the peasant's intuition (even if it made a good showing in the past) and to contrast it with scientific knowledge, given the present-day state of agriculture in many Asian, African and Latin American countries (when transformations in agriculture, agrarian reform and the introduction of new agricultural machinery are a pressing need to stamp out hunger) is an untenable and often harmful ideological policy. It is just as ill-judged to block deliberately the transformation of social relations that perpetuate the exploitation of man by man and the oppression of some people by others.

These concepts are clearly of little help in solving either economic and social, or even cultural problems. The developing nations' striving towards social and economic progress requires from them colossal labour, selflessness and perseverance in combating backwardness and calls for an economic, social and political structure that would guarantee the best possible utilization of all resources in building society without exploitation.

All these tasks can be solved only in alliance with the forces of progress. It is only natural therefore that the more far-sighted representatives of the developing countries believe that the road to freedom and progress is in the final analysis the road to socialism.

As a social organization, socialism creates conditions most favourable for the harmonious development of every person; it involves the mass of the people in collective labour and creative activity, promotes the development of science and on this basis of the national productive forces. J. Ki-Zerbo, a progressive scholar from Upper Volta, pointed out: "Until we set up research centers ... we will merely be an object of research rather than an active scientific force and will, consequently, lose control over our own world."[1] Progressive scientists insist on the need to include science not only in the production process but in a wider context of social culture. "Above all, it is still not recognized clearly enough," Dr. Husain Zaheer, Vice-President of the World Federation of Scientific Workers, said, "that the development of science and technology and its subsequent operation can only be through the hands and brains of those not only themselves qualified in science and technology, but also imbued with a broad, liberal and rational outlook devoid of the blight of obscurantism."[2] Lebanese physicist A. B. Zahlan believes that the liberated nations' progress largely depends on the development of a new world outlook oriented to science.[3] Indeed it is impossible to build a new and progressive society without drawing on scientific sociology and scientific world outlook.

The historical experience of the past hundred years shows that the truly scientific theory of solving these problems is provided by dialectical materialism and other social sciences founded by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

The Marxist doctrine of the universal laws and concrete forms of the historical process is an important methodological aid in studying and transforming today's societies in Asian, African and Latin American countries. Marxism does not deny that in principle it is possible to use certain mechanisms of traditionalism and socio-psychological customs in the course of social transformations. However, this can only be done on the basis of studying the specific historical conditions of the development of a certain society.

The efforts at doing away with traditionalism and the old spiritual values and culture, just as the desire to adapt all their manifestations to meet the needs of modernization, cannot be an end in itself for the progressive forces in the developing countries. The ways to and forms of the decline of the archaic traditions or economic modes depend on the extent, scope and pace of socio-economic reforms in particular countries. It is only possible to draw up an efficient social development strategy for the emergent countries on the basis of an in-depth scientific analysis of their socio-economic structures with due account of the multiplicity of the internal and external factors characterizing their specific national features. This analysis shows that the only acceptable way of development for those countries is socialism, socialist orientation.

This conclusion has been drawn by the more far-sighted leaders of emergent states. According to Tunisian President Bourguiba: "We have come to the conclusion that the private sector is incapable of regeneration or of developing production on an adequate scale... We were confronted with the need to make a choice. On the one hand, we could use free market economy in the hope of seeing the miracle, which took place in some European countries in the last century, repeat itself in Tunisia. But this system would make us wait a long time, and the needs were urgent and the catastrophe imminent... Tunisia lacks that type of powerful and daring businessmen, that could start an enterprise on a gigantic scale so as to form the basis of a bourgeoisie such as exists in Europe... Had we opted for free market economy, we would have reopened the way for foreign capitalism... Therefore we decided to use the system of regulated economy, in which great economic tasks are the concern of the state... We examined the state of this experiment and concluded that it would lead us to the road of socialism. This evolution is to lead us inevitably to a situation in which the means of production will become public property."[1]

---

[1] *Inostrannaya Literatura* (Foreign Literature), No. 10, 1970, p. 212 (in Russian).

[2] *The World of Science*, No. 2, 1968, p. 9 (in Russian).

[3] A.B. Zahlan, *Science in the Arab Middle East*, Minerva, 1970, Vol. VIII, No. 1, pp. 8-35.

Unable to ignore similar intentions on the part of the peoples of the developing states, bourgeois philosophy works out other theories, which outwardly correspond to these intentions but which are, like previous theories, designed to divert these countries from the socialist road of development. The authors of these theories no longer dispute that it is important for the newly-free nations to look for new ways of development and to strive for "untraditional goals". Their precepts for such a development encourage search for "new" ways only within the framework of "free enterprise" and within the bounds of the old world outlook and old mentality.

Judge for yourselves. Western economist and sociologist W. Rostow believes that the actuating spring of transition from one stage of socio-economic development to another lies in man's world outlook and is intrinsically psychological. This transformation of relatively static "traditional" society into subsequent dynamic stages requires, according to Rostow, a number of conditions, with the most basic change being "psychological".[2] Recommendations stemming from these concepts in fact boil down to urges to change not the social conditions but man and his personality in the "necessary" direction, which implies enterprising, bourgeois socio-psychological motivation and orientation. It is also recommended to promote social requirements that are, as a rule, meant to satisfy the needs of the bourgeoisie, the upper crust of the intelligentsia and office workers, and traditionalist nobility, which catastrophically deepens the gap between the material well-being of the broad strata of the working people and that of a handful of people of power and property.

---

[1] Cited from: *The Struggle of Ideas in the Modern World*, pp. 138-39.

[2] See: W. Rostow, *Politics and Stages of Growth*, Cambridge University Press, 1971, p. 26.

Bourgeois philosophers and sociologists also give extensive support to those ideologists from the newly-free countries who, reflecting the bitterness and despair of the multitude deprived by capitalist development of both the means of existence and any social stability, try to find the so-called "third" way of development that has no links with any social experience gained by the developed countries.

Bourgeois ideologists are willing to help because they know that there is no nor can there be any "third" way and that all quests in this direction are futile. But if the emergent states are not tempted by capitalism, let them find themselves in an impasse rather than embark upon the road of socialist orientation, the road of socialist transformations. This provocative activity is exemplified by bourgeois philosophers' support for leftist radicals and ultra-revolutionary trends in some developing countries. As they denounce the desire of the privileged strata to use old ethical values for purposes alien to the people and show that old norms and ideas are barren, the representatives of these trends want to reject and destroy old culture completely rather than to remake it. Instead of criticizing the "earthly roots" of ideological illusions or mobilizing people for constructive work, the leftist radicals deem it possible to confine themselves to eliminating old institutions and traditions in the hope that a new culture will emerge of its own accord in the course of the revolution. They advocate "ruthless extirpation" of family, ethnic and communal relations and forms of culture and suggest that the mass of traditionalists should be speedily "put" into the "cauldron of the revolution". They strip culture of production and materialist orientation under the pretext that it was introduced by the Western bourgeoisie and can distract the mass of the people from perpetual revolutionary activity. These intentions of the leftist radicals are ardently supported by various leftists from pseudo-revolutionary organizations. However, the situation of the mass of the people cannot be altered through destructive activity alone; living labor without the industrial means of production cannot put an end to society's backwardness. In practice such a stand impoverishes culture, reducing it to limited principles of only formal revolutionary importance.

The concepts of Frantz Fanon well exemplify radical leftist ideology in Africa. He completely rejects European civilization, in which he sees no positive values. All its achievements have been paid for by huge sacrifices on the part of mankind, while European history seems to be a "succession of negations of man and an avalanche of crimes".[1] For this reason it is necessary not to "imitate Europe" but to "strain our muscles and brains in a new direction". "The Third World faces Europe today as a colossal mass, whose task should be to try and resolve the problems that Europe has been unable to resolve."[1] He similarly treats traditional culture, considering it to be archaic and inappropriate for new tasks. According to him, old social institutions are to be replaced by new ones born in the flames of struggle. He is, however, not quite sure what these new institutions should be like. In some countries the progressive forces have to overcome the consequences of rebelliousness to ensure that the people should understand the actual conditions of life and struggle and to use the revolutionary enthusiasm of the people in transforming society in practice.

---

[1] Frantz Fanon, *Les damnés de la terre,* François Maspero, Paris, 1961, p. 240.

The aforementioned approaches adopted by bourgeois ideologists in tackling the problems of development of the Oriental nations constitute, beyond doubt, but a fraction of stratagems used in ideological warfare as a result of the mounting national liberation and democratic revolutions in Asian, African and Latin American countries. Nevertheless, the examples given graphically demonstrate that bourgeois philosophy, which forms the foundation of all modern ideological and political concepts of imperialism, invariably defends the interests of the ruling classes and hamstrings the people's struggle for their emancipation, no matter where, when and in what forms it is carried out. This is borne out by its struggle against both the socialist countries and the developing states.

## *Test Questions*

1. What are the main characteristics of modern bourgeois philosophy?
2. What is the essence of modern positivism (neo-positivism) and what varieties of neo-positivism do you know?
3. What is the message of existence philosophy?
4. What goals does bourgeois philosophy set itself in the emergent countries?

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 240-41.

# CONCLUSION

We have covered the main ideas of dialectical materialism on nature, man and society. Obviously not all topics were given equal space. Some problems were altogether beyond the scope of this book. The world around us is so complicated, controversial and changing, and still we hope that our readers will find the book useful and will be able to make many important conclusions.

They are certainly aware that no one can find his bearings in the world nor be a conscious master of his life without fully realizing the essence of the surrounding world and the laws of reality or without having scientific ideas about the essence of human society and the laws of its development. They are bound to come to the conclusion that philosophy has a great role to play in the life of society.

It is also obvious that by no means all philosophies are useful. The history of philosophical, social and political thought has known various ideas and theories with the help of which people sought to explain the world. But it is only materialist philosophy, particularly its highest form–dialectical materialism developed by Marx, Engels and Lenin–that gives scientific answers to all the problems involved with the world, man and society. This philosophy has proved scientifically that the world around exists objectively, that it has been created by no one and that it is eternal, infinite and in a state of continuous motion.

The world develops on the basis of objective laws, and this development leads at certain stages to the emergence of life, man and consciousness. The latter helps man to reflect the surrounding world, to find his bearings in this world and to transform it. That he succeeds in doing this the right way attests to the fact that the world is knowable.

Human society forms part of nature and, like nature, it develops in keeping with the requirements of special laws operating objectively. Like nature, society is knowable and, consequently, can be built in accordance with the requirements of cognized objective laws, without disproportion or injustice.

The dialectical materialist approach to analyzing the outstanding problems of our time makes it possible to understand why human society and modern civilizations experience great upheavals, what social classes and social groups engender ills and injustice, who is to blame for the outbreak of wars and other types of violence, and who is responsible for misfortunes and suffering. History supplies the impartial verdict that the cause of all human adversity lies in the exploiters, whereas the progress of human society is due to the activity of the working classes.

Inasmuch as dialectical materialism provides this knowledge and it is corroborated by daily life, it is subjected to slanderous attack from the exploiters. For this purpose they resort to idealism,an antiquated philosophical theory, which they revamp with the help of new pseudo-theories wrapped in pseudo-scientific form, and spread throughout the public at large.

After learning the main aspects of idealist philosophy and analyzing what it opposes and what it defends, readers will rightfully conclude that idealism and especially modern bourgeois philosophy, apart from being unscientific, is also reactionary. Bourgeois theories do not explain the world but distort it, obscuring people's minds and seeking on this basis to reconcile them with the system of exploitation. As the philosophical groundwork of all modern bourgeois theories, idealism is used to consolidate the positions of the reactionaries and to unleash and justify fratricidal wars between peoples. Idealism and bourgeois ideology hinder social progress, therefore it is constantly necessary to oppose them and to expose the true aims of bourgeois political and social concepts.

Conversely, since Marxism-Leninism and its component, dialectical materialism, make it possible to understand the world around, to have a general idea of new developments in life, and to study the laws of development of human society, it is necessary to learn, defend and propagandize the conclusions of this philosophy. Only this philosophy and Marxism-Leninism as a whole serve the purposes of building a society without exploitation and chart the ways for the progressive development of world civilization.

## GLOSSARY OF PHILOSOPHICAL TERMS

AESTHETICS: The branch of philosophy that provides a theory of the laws and principles of the beautiful.

AGNOSTICISM: A philosophical theory which denies the possibility of cognizing the objective world, its essence and laws and leads to idealism. It is characteristic of D. Hume, I. Kant and other idealist philosophers and also of modern bourgeois philosophy.

ANALYSIS: In the most general sense of the word the process of mental or actual dissection of the whole into its components with the aim of cognizing reality. It is inseparable from synthesis (see *Synthesis*) and has an important role to play in the cognitive process as a general scientific method of cognition.

ANTI-COMMUNISM: The ideological and political concepts of modern imperialist reaction directed against the ideology and practice of communism. It boils down to calumny of the socialist system and the falsification of the policies and aims of the communist parties and the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism.

ATHEISM: A system of views characterized by disbelief in the supernatural (spirits, gods, the afterlife, etc.) and denial of any religion.

BASIS: The sum of production relations that constitute the economic structure of society (relations of property, distribution, exchange and consumption).

BEING: A philosophical concept expressing objective reality, matter, existing independently of man's consciousness.

BEING, SOCIAL: The material life of society, which is made up of the production of material benefits and material relations that are established among people in the production process and the everyday life of society.

CAPITALISM: A socio-economic formation based on the private ownership of the means of production and the exploitation of wage labour by capital and characterized by the anarchy of production, regular economic crises and chronic unemployment.

CAPITALIST: Owner of capital using it to exploit the working people.

CATEGORIES: General concepts reflecting essential and universal properties and relationships of reality and cognition.

CLASSES: Large groups of people distinguished by the place they occupy in the system of social production, by their relation to the means of production, by their role in the social organization of labour, by the share of social wealth which they dispose of and the mode of acquiring it.

COMMUNISM: A classless social system with one form of public ownership of the means of production and full social equality of all members of society, in which everyone works according to one's ability and gets according to one's needs.

DEMOCRACY: A form of rule based on the principle of subordinating minority to majority and on the recognition of men as free and equal beings. True democracy is ensured only under socialism.

DEMOGRAPHY: The study of human population, its size, growth, density, distribution, and its socio-economic, cultural and other features.

DETERMINISM: The philosophical doctrine holding that all phenomena are interconnected and ruled by causality, and governed by objective laws.

DIALECTICS: The science about the general laws of development and the universal relationship of nature, society and thinking. The basic laws of dialectics are those of the unity and struggle of opposites, the transformation of quantitative into qualitative changes, and the negation of negation. The non-basic laws of dialectics include a stable, objective and recurrent relationship between phenomenon and essence, form and content, cause and effect, necessity and chance, and so on.

DOGMATISM: The mode of thinking using unchanged concepts and formulae, without taking into account concrete circumstances of time and place or new data of science and practice.

DUALISM: The philosophical doctrine, which asserts that the world consists of two equal fundamental entities, such as spirit and matter, and which opposes monism. Its prominent representative was Descartes.

EMPIRICISM: The erroneous philosophical doctrine in the theory of knowledge that recognizes experience, especially of the senses, as the only source of knowledge.

ETHICS: The branch of philosophy dealing with moral principles and specific moral choices as a form of social consciousness.

EVOLUTION: Development characterized by a gradual quantitative change in a phenomenon, as distinct from revolution which brings about a more or less quick qualitative change.

EXISTENTIALISM: A trend of modern bourgeois philosophy characterized by pessimism, the subjectivist interpretation of freedom, denial of logical knowledge and assertion of intuitive cognition of reality.

EXPANSION: Extension of the sphere of domination by monopoly associations and capitalist states through economic means (exporting capital, enslaving loans, etc.) and extra-economic methods (armed seizures, diplomatic pressure).

EXPLOITATION: The appropriation of products of other people's (workers' and peasants') labour by the owners of the means of production.

FASCISM: The political movement which expresses the interests of the most aggressive circles of the imperialist bourgeoisie and exercizes a patently terrorist dictatorship of monopoly capital. It is characterized by anti-communism, the elimination of democratic freedoms, chauvinism, racism and the unleashing of wars of aggression.

FATALISM: The philosophic doctrine holding that the world process is predetermined by supreme will, fate.

FEUDALISM: The socio-economic formation which followed the slave-owning system and preceded capitaism. The main antagonistic classes of feudal society were the feudal landowners and the dependent peasants. The economic system of feudalism is characterized by the fact that the land, the principal means of production, was the monopoly of the feudal lords, while the economy was run by small peasant producers.

FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION OF PHILOSOPHY: the question of the relationship between thinking and being, consciousness and matter, viewed from two angles: 1) what is primary, thinking or being? and 2) whether the mind is capable of cognizing the world correctly. Depending on the way they answer these questions, philosophers are divided into materialists and idealists, into those who recognize the knowability of the world and those who do not (agnostics).

GEOPOLITICS: A reactionary political concept justifying imperialist expansion by reference to natural and geographical conditions (the country's territory and location, etc.).

GNOSEOLOGY: The division of philosophy studying the laws and possibilities of cognition, the relation of knowledge to objective reality, the stages and forms of the cognitive process and the criteria of true knowledge. The same as the theory of knowledge.

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM: A component of Marxism-Leninism studying society as an integral and developing social system, the main laws and motive forces of the historical process.

HUMANISM: A world outlook which is characterized by love of the people, respect for human dignity and rights and concern for men's well-being and harmonious development, it is formed by dialectical materialism.

HYLOZOISM: The doctrine that life and, consequently, sensibility are a property of all things in nature.

HYPOTHESIS: An assertion which uses certain facts to make a conclusion about the existence of objects, relationships or causes of phenomena not directly observed and which is subject to proof. A hypothesis verified by practice becomes a scientific theory.

IDEALISM: The philosophical trend, which opposes materialism in its answer to the fundamental question of philosophy and proceeds from the recognition of the spirit, consciousness, as primary and of matter as secondary. Its main forms are: 1) objective idealism, which asserts that the world is created by some kind of objective consciousness existing outside and independent of man (Plato, Hegel, and others) and 2) subjective idealism, which denies the existence of any reality outside of the consciousness of the subject and reduces all knowledge of the world to individual consciousness (Berkeley, Kant, Mach, Avenarius, and others).

IDEOLOGY: A system of political, legal, ethical, aesthetical, religious and philosophical views and ideas, which reflect and evaluate the relationship between people and reality from the point of view of one class or another. There is scientific (Marxist-Leninist) and unscientific (bourgeois) ideology.

IMPERIALISM: Monopoly capitlaism, the highest and last stage of capitalism, and a highly reactionary form of political domination by exploiters and of enslaving nations.

INDETERMINISM: The idealist philosophical theory, which denies objective causality among natural and social phenomena.

INTERNATIONALISM: International solidarity of the working class and the Communists of all countries in their struggle for common aims, national liberation and social progress; defence of the freedom, independence and equality of all nations and races, co-operaton and friendship among them.

INTUITIONISM: An idelaist trend in philosophy in which intuition is appealed to as the only reliable means to cognition. Intuition is interpreted as a special ability of consciousness, which has nothing to do with living perception or abstract thinking.

IRRATIONALISM: An idelaist trend in philosophy restricting the cognitive abilities of the mind and thinking, and recognizing instinct, imagination, the subconscious, intuition, etc. as the main form of cognition.

LAW: An indispensable, stable and recurrent relationship between phenomena in nature and society.

LIFE: A special form of the motion of matter emerging as a new property of matter in the process of its development. Living organisms are distinguished from inanimate objects by metabolism and the ability to reproduce, adapt themselves, grow and develop.

MATERIALISM: A philosophical trend which asserts that the world is material and exists objectively, outside and independent of man's consciousness, that matter is primary and has not been created by anyone and that consciousness is a property of matter and, consequently, is secondary to it. The historical forms of materialism were as follows: 1) spontaneous materialism (Democritus, Epicurus), 2) mechanistic materialism (Bacon, Hobbes, Locke, Holbach, etc.), 3) anthropological materialism (Feuerbach), 4) materialist philosophy of Russian revolutionary democrats (Chernyshevsky, Herzen, Belinsky), 5) dialectical and historical materialism (Marx, Engels, Lenin).

MATTER: An objective reality, everything which exists independent of man's consciousness and is reflected in it. It is a philosophical category denoting the objective reality which is given to man in his sensations, and which is copied, photographed and reflected by our sensations, while existing independently of them.

MECHANISTIC PHILOSOPHY: A one-sided approach to the phenomena, which was set forth in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and explained the development of nature and society by the laws of mechanical motion. It stems from absolutizing the laws of mechanics.

METAPHYSICS: The philosophical method which views phenomena unchanging and independent of each other, denies internal contradictions as a source of development and does not recognize ascending, progressive development. The metaphysical method is the antithesis of the dialectical method.

MORALITY or ETHICS: a form of social consciousness and a type of social relations (moral relations), a basic means of regulating man's activity in society with the help of standards and rules. In contrast to ordinary customs or traditions, morality is substantiated by the ideals of good and evil, justice and so on; it has a class character.

MOTION: The mode of existence of matter; in the most general form any change in general, any interaction of material objects.

MYSTICISM: A decadent frame of mind and doctrine, belief in the existence of the supernatural world; it maintains that genuine reality is beyond intellectual apprehension but is directly accessible to intution. Man is claimed to be powerless in the realm of nature and unable to change his situation in any way.

NATIONALISM: Bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology, policy and special psychology, which is based on the recognition of the national superiority and national exclusiveness of one nation or another and is used to establish "class peace" between the working people and the exploiters. In the colonial and dependent countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America, nationalism has a progressive aspect and a general democratic content that is directed against imperialism and colonialism.

NATIONALIZATION: The transfer of privately owned enterprises and economic sectors into state property with the aim of putting an end to the exploitation of man by man.

NEWLY-FREE COUNTRIES: A group of independent countries, which have cast away the yoke of imperialism and colonialism but lag behind the capitalist and socialist countries in the level of their social and economic development as a result of their protracted colonial exploitation by imperialist states.

NON-ALIGNED COUNTRIES: Nations which announce their abstention from military and political blocs and groupings as the basic principle of their foreign policy.

OBSCURANTISM: Oppositions to science and enlightenment and defence of antiquated and reactionary ideas.

OPPORTUNISM: A theory and practice in the workers' movement, which runs counter to the true interests of the proletariat and leads the workers' movement to class collaboration with the bourgeoisie. As far as class nature is concerned, it is a manifestation of petty-bourgeois ideology and policy sometimes in the form of revisionism and sometimes in the form of dogmatism.

PAN-ISLAMISM: Religious and political ideology based on the ideas of the "unity" of Muslims throughout the world and of the need for their rallying together in a single Muslim state. It incorporates attempts to combine the liberation movement against imperialism with strengthening the positions of khans, landowners and mullahs.

PERCEPTION: A mental process, a reflection by the mind of objects and phenomena acting in a given moment, an integral image of an object produced as a result of the objective world's impact on the sense-organs.

PHENOMENALISM: The theory that maintains that knowledge is limited to cognizing phenomena and denies the knowability of the essence of things. Leads to subjective idealism or agnosticism.

PHILOSOPHY: A system of views, ideas and concepts of nature, society and thinking. The philosophy of dialectical materialism is the science about general laws of nature, society and thinking.

POSITIVISM: A trend of bourgeois philosophy asserting that all genuine (positive) knowledge is accumulated by special sciences and that science needs no philosophy to be placed above it, in other words, the cognitive value of philosophical studies is denied.

PROGRESS: Development characterized by transition from the lower to the higher form, from an imperfect to a more perfect state.

PROLETARIAT: A basic class of capitalist society, whose representatives, possessing neither capital nor production means, are compelled to sell their labour power to earn the means of existence.

RACISM: A reactionary, unscientific and spurious theory based on the ideas of physical and mental inequality of human races and of the primeval division of people into higher and lower races, with some of them allegedly predestined to be rulers and the others meant to be slaves.

RATIONALISM: The philosophical theory that reason is the only valid basis for man's knowledge and action. Its limitations consist in divorcing logical knowledge from sensory knowledge.

REFORM: A transformation, change of some aspect of social life carried out by the ruling class without changing fundamentally the existing system. Reforms are progressive undertakings in the newly-free countries and serve to build society without exploitation.

REGRESSION: Reversion from higher development forms to lower ones, retrogression, change for the worse.

RELATIVISM: The idealist theory stemming from the metaphysical absolutizing of the relative nature of our knowledge and leading to denial of the possibility of cognizing objective truth and to agnosticism.

RELIGION: The illusory reflection in people's minds of those external forces which govern them, a reflection in which terrestrial forces assume the form of supernatural forces. A world outlook and attitude, as well as corresponding behavior and specific acts (ritual) based on belief in the supernatural.

REPUBLIC: A form of rule in which state authority is vested in bodies of power elected for a certain term.

REVISIONISM: Trends in the workers' movement that are hostile to Marxism and seek to vulgarize and distort it by revising or rejecting its basic principles and replacing them by bourgeois or petty-bourgeois theories.

REVOLUTION: A radical, qualitative change, a leap-like transition from one state to another, from the old to the new in the development of some phenomena in nature, society or cognition.

SCHOLASTICISM: Medieval theological and idealist philosophy whose proponents sought to substantiate theoretically a religious world outlook.

SCIENCE: A field of man's activity and the system of knowledge of reality reflecting processes of the objective world in the fullest and most correct way. It is conventionally divided into natural, social and technical sciences.

SCIENTIFIC COMMUNISM (scientific socialism): A component part of Marxism-Leninism (alongside scientific philosophy and political economy) which outlines the general laws, ways and forms of the proletariat's class struggle, the socialist revolution and the building of socialism and communism. In the broad sense of the term it is equivalent to Marxism-Leninism as a whole.

SENSATION: A reflection of properties of objective reality as a result of their acting on sense-organs and exciting nerve centres in the brain. There are numerous types of sensations, including sensations of touch, sight, sound and smell.

SENSUALISM: The philosophical theory that sensation is the only source of knowledge, the antithesis of rationalism.

SOCIALISM: A social system which comes into being after the bourgeois mode of production is eliminated and the dictatorship of the proletariat established and which is based on the public ownership of the means of production. It is the first stage of communist society with the basic principle: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work".

SOLIPSISM: The subjective idealist theory which maintains that there exists only man and his consciousness and that the objective world exists only within man's mind.

SOPHISM: A deceptive but seemingly plausible argument based on the ambiguity of concepts, on singling out individual aspects of phenomena and so on.

STATE: The political organization of the class dominating economically whose aim is to maintain the existing order and to suppress the resistance of other classes through a special machine of coercion.

SYNTHESIS: (from Greek, a putting together): A mental or actual recomposition of the whole from its components. It is a method of scientific cognition, a logical deduction based on abstract notions.

SUBSTANCE: The essential nature of anything, the primary or basic element of all things and phenomena. According to materialism, eternally moving and changing matter is the sole substance, whereas idealists recognize the spirit, the idea, and eventually God as the substance.

SUFISM: An Islamic religious and mystical doctrine which denies the authenticity of both sensory and logical knowledge and preaches asceticism and the renunciation of the mundane. True knowledge, according to the Sufis, is obtained only through divine revelation.

TELEOLOGY: The idealist study, according to which, everything in nature is purposeful and any development is determined by certain goals, which are either set by God or constitute the inherent causes of natural processes.

THEOLOGY: An organized, often formalized body of opinions concerning God and Man's relationship to God.

TIME: A form of the existence of matter reflecting duration and regularity of processes, phenomena and states of matter.

TRANSITION FROM CAPITALISM TO SOCAILISM: A special historical period following the victory of the socialist revolution, during which the material and technical basis of socialism is built and socialist production relations are established. The length of this period is determined by the historical conditions in one country or another.

TRIBALISM: The sense of cultural, religious, social and political exclusiveness of a tribe manifest in tribal enmity primarily in Africa.

TRUTH: A truthful and correct reflection of objects and phenomena by the cognizing subject the way they exist outside and independent of man's consciousness.

UTILITARIANISM: The bourgeois ethical doctrine that considers utility as the criterion of the moral value of action and recognizes the useful as good and worth-while.

VOLUNTARISM: A trend of idealist philosophy and psychology recognizing the primacy of will rather than that of perception or thought.

WAR: Organized armed struggle between states (or classes), the socio-political essence of which is the continuation of these states' (or classes') policy by means of armed coercion.

WORLD SOCIALIST SYSTEM: A social, economic and political community of countries developing towards socialism and communism.

WORLD OUTLOOK: A system of generalized views of the objective world and man's place in it and of people's attitude to their surroundings and to themselves. It is necessary to differentiate between scientific world outlook moulded by dialectical materialism and unscientific world outlook shaped by idealist philosophy.

ZOROASTRIANISM: A philosophical and religious doctrine which was current in Central Asia, Iran, Afghanistan and some other countries in the Antiquity and had some materialist views. Its main principles are belief in one god, Ahura Marda, the two counterbalancing spirits, good and evil, the struggle between which accounts for the development of the world, and the ultimate triumph of the good spirit.

# REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

## Progress Publishers

**put out recently**

*Communism: Questions and Answers.* Issue 6

The present issue of the popular series on theoretical and practical aspects of building communism examines the tasks and objectives of the socio-economic programme put forward by the 26th CPSU Congress. The reader will learn why Communists stand for cultural cooperation between countries of different social systems and of their attitude towards mass media and morals.

Among the contributors are well-known scholars, public figures and journalists.

The issue is intended for the general reader interested in the life in the Sovier Union.

**Progress Publishers**

**will soon publish**

*A Dictionary of Scientific Communism.*

This book is in fact a small encyclopaedia of sorts, whose more than two hundred and fifty articles deal with problems of scientific communism—a component part of Marxism-Leninism. It dwells on the theory and on the development of the world revolutionary process as well as the ideological struggle at the present stage.

The book is intended for the general reader interested in problems of scientific communism.